DOWN THESE MEAN STREETS: VIOLENCE BY AND AGAINST AMERICA'S CHILDREN

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FIRST CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, MAY 16, 1989

Printed for the use of the
Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

99-355 WASHINGTON : 1989

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, DC 20402

H961-26

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES

GEORGE MILLER, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
PATRICIA SCHROEDER, Colorado
LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS, Louisiana
MATTHEW F. McHUGH, New York
TED WEISS, New York
BERYL ANTHONY, JR., Arkansas
BARBARA BOXER, California
SANDER M. LEVIN, Michigan
BRUCE A. MORRISON, Connecticut
J. ROY ROWLAND, Georgia
GERRY SIKORSKI, Minnesota
ALAN WHEAT, Missouri
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
LANE EVANS, Illinois
RICHARD J. DURBIN, Illinois
DAVID E. SKAGGS, Colorado
BILL SARPALIUS, Texas

THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR., Virginia
FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia
BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH, Nevada
RON PACKARD, California
J. DENNIS HASTERT, Illinois
CLYDE C. HOLLOWAY, Louisiana
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
CURT WELDON, Pennsylvania
LAMAR S. SMITH, Texas
PETER SMITH, Vermont
JAMES T. WALSH, New York
RONALD K. MACHTLEY, Rhode Island

COMMITTEE STAFF

ANN ROSEWATER, *Staff Director*
DENNIS G. SMITH, *Minority Staff Director*
CAROL M. STATUTO, *Minority Deputy Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, DC, May 16, 1989	1
Statement of:	
Bell, Carl C., M.D., director, Community Mental Health Council, southside, Chicago, IL, appearing on behalf of the American Psychiatric Association, Washington, DC	12
Elliott, Delbert S., Ph.D., professor of sociology, Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO	107
Loken, Gregory A., Esq., executive director of the Institute for Youth Advocacy and a senior staff attorney at Covenant House, New York City, NY	68
Meier, Deborah, principal of the Central Park East Secondary School in East Harlem, New York, NY	51
Simms, Capt. Jacqueline, acting commander, youth division, Metropolitan Police Department, Washington, DC	99
Spivak, Howard, M.D., deputy commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Public Health, Boston, MA	28
Walton, Hon. Reggie B., associate judge, Superior Court of the District of Columbia; and nominee for associate director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Washington, DC	44
Zinsmeister, Karl, adjunct research associate, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington, DC	115
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:	
Bell, Carl C., M.D., Community Mental Health Council, southside, Chicago, IL:	
Letter to Carl Bell, M.D., dated May 14, 1986, from R. Eugene Pincham	148
Letter to Chairman George Miller, dated June 2, 1989, with response to questions posed by Congressman Lamar Smith	146
Prepared statement of	16
Save Our Sons and Daughters, Newsletter, July 14, 1988, No. 14	156
Schedule of events for Mayor Harold Washington's "Chicago War Against Crime Week," August 10 through 16, 1986	150
Schedule of events for "Strike Out Violence for a Safer Community," in observance of National Victim's Rights Week, April 8 through April 15, 1989	152
Bliley, Hon. Thomas J., a Representative in Congress from the State of Virginia, and ranking Republican Member, opening statement of	11
Elliott, Delbert S., Ph.D., University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, prepared statement of	111
Loken, Gregory, executive director of the Institute for Youth Advocacy and a senior staff attorney at Covenant House, New York City, NY, prepared statement of	71
Meier, Deborah, principal of the Central Park East Secondary School in East Harlem, New York, NY:	
Prepared statement of	55
Response to questions posed by Congressman Lamar Smith	168
Miller, Hon. George, a Representative in Congress from the State of California, and chairman, Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families:	
"Down These Mean Streets: Violence By and Against America's Children," (a fact sheet)	4
Letter to Carl C. Bell, M.D., dated May 19, 1989, asking for response to questions posed by Congressman Lamar Smith	145

Page

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera—Continued
Miller, Hon. George, a Representative in Congress from the State of California, and chairman, Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families—Continued
Letter to Deborah Meier, dated May 19, 1989, asking for response to questions posed by Congressman Lamar Smith 167
Letter to Hon. Reggie B. Walton, dated May 19, 1989, asking for response to questions posed by Congressman Lamar Smith 164
Opening statement of 2
Simms, Capt. Jacqueline, Metropolitan Police Department's Youth Division, Washington, DC, prepared statement of 102
Spivak, Howard, M.D., deputy commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Public Health, Boston, MA, prepared statement of 31
Stith, Deborah-Prothrow, M.D., Commissioner of Public Health, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, enclosing letter to James Mason, M.D., Ph.D., dated March 28, 1989 36
Walton, Hon. Reggie B., associate judge, Superior Court of the District of Columbia; and nominee for associate director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Washington, DC:
Prepared statement of 47
Response to questions posed by Congressman Lamar Smith 165
Zinsmeister, Karl, writer, consultant, adjunct research associate, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington, DC, prepared statement of 121

DOWN THESE MEAN STREETS: VIOLENCE BY AND AGAINST AMERICA'S CHILDREN

TUESDAY, MAY 16, 1989

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 9:35 a.m., in room 2322, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. George Miller (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Miller (the chairman), Boggs, Boxer, Levin, Rowland, Evans, Bliley, and Lamar Smith.

Also present: Representative Hayes of Illinois.

Staff present: Ann Rosewater, staff director; Timothy Gilligan, research assistant; Howard Pinderhughes, professional staff; Dennis Smith, minority staff director; Carol Statuto, minority deputy staff director; and Joan Godley, committee clerk.

Chairman MILLER. The Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families will come to order for the purposes of conducting the hearing entitled "Down These Mean Streets: Violence By and Against America's Children."

Violence involving children is the central focus of our hearing this morning. In the past, the committee has highlighted problems of youth violence and gangs and growing racial tension among teenagers. But during the last several months, the dramatic incidents of violence among young Americans have shocked and outraged the Nation. Whether in response to a band of youths "wilding" in New York City's Central Park, brutally raping a woman and attacking others, or District of Columbia, Los Angeles or Miami youth fighting fatal drug wars over "turf," or an Alexandria youth killing a friend over a pair of sneakers, a sense of outrage at this lawlessness and a desire for swift and fair justice affects us all.

Unlike the protests which brought our cities to flames 20 years ago, today's violence is not about a cause. Indeed, experts trace this violence to a breakdown in the sense of community, of shared values, of a meaningful stake in society and a chance to hope and dream about opportunities in the future. These factors help explain the level of violence, but they do not begin to justify it.

Incidents such as the Central Park attack, which appear unusually savage and senseless, are actually part of a growing trend of serious violence by and against children and youth. Between 1983 and 1987, arrests of male juveniles for murder increased 23 percent, and for aggravated assault by 17 percent. Police officers

across the country report that victims and perpetrators of violent crimes are younger than ever before.

Gun fights and murders have become so common in some inner city neighborhoods that we risk becoming numb to their traumatic impact on the children and families who are witnesses. Homicide is the second leading cause of death among all 15 to 24 year olds in the United States. Among black youth, homicide is the number one cause of death. The ready availability of guns and drugs has undoubtedly exacerbated this problem.

As violence has become more visible, the public, the media, the legislators struggle to understand it. Whether youth are victimizers or victims, the causes of this violence are complex and solutions multi-faceted. We have a national emergency in our midst that is not entirely comprehensible but which requires marshaling our best known knowledge, our long held principles of right and wrong, law and justice, and our deepest sense of compassion. If anything is clear, it is that we have yet to find satisfactory answers.

For this reason, it is important to resist the inclination to supply simple explanations or quick fix solutions. We must at once condemn violent behavior by children or anyone else, but strive to prevent it. Historically, condemnation has proven very easy while prevention has remained elusive.

As we attempt to increase our knowledge about violence, however, it is important to remember that the attacks and the killings that receive the most attention from the media and the public are not the typical incidents of violence. If we are serious about reducing violence, we must attend to less sensational, daily incidents that take place outside of the television spotlights.

Our witnesses today include noted leaders in law enforcement and the judicial system, criminologists, public health officials, psychiatrists and educators. They come from the communities which have directly and recently experienced the incidents now well-known around the Nation and the world. We will not only learn of the increase in violent behavior by youth but that four factors—poverty, abuse as a child, witnessing family violence and substance abuse—increase the risk that a child will later become a victimizer. We welcome them to the committee and look forward to their ability to assist the Congress and the public in better understanding this deeply disturbing national crisis.

[Opening statement of Hon. George Miller follows:]

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE MILLER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND CHAIRMAN, SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES

Violence involving children is the subject of today's hearing by the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. In the past, the Committee has highlighted problems of youth violence, gangs, and growing racial tensions among teenagers. But during the last several months, the dramatic incidence of violence among young Americans has shocked and outraged the nation.

Whether in response to a band of youth "wilding" through New York City's Central Park brutally raping a woman and attacking others, or District of Columbia, Los Angeles or Miami youth fighting fatal drug wars over "turf," or an Alexandria, Virginia teenager killing his friend over a pair of sneakers, a sense of outrage at this lawlessness and a desire for swift and fair justice affects all of us.

Unlike the protests which brought our cities to flames twenty years ago, today's violence is not about a cause. Indeed, experts trace this violence to the breakdown of

a sense of community, of shared values, of a meaningful stake in the society, and a chance to hope and dream about opportunities in the future. These factors help explain the level of violence, but they do not begin to justify it.

Incidents such as the Central Park attack, which appear unusually savage and senseless, are actually part of a growing trend of serious violence by and against children and youth. Between 1983 and 1987, arrests of male juveniles for murder increased by 23 percent and for aggravated assault by 17 percent. Police officers across the country report that victims and perpetrators of violent crimes are younger than ever before.

Gunfights and murders have become so common in some inner city neighborhoods that we risk becoming numb to their traumatic impact on the children and families who are witness. Homicide is the second leading cause of death among *all* 15 to 24 year olds in the United States. Among black youth, homicide is the number one cause of death. The ready availability of guns and drugs has undoubtedly exacerbated this problem.

As violence has become more visible, the public, the media, and legislators struggle to understand it. Whether youth are victimizers or victims, the causes of this violence are complex and the solutions multifaceted. We have a national emergency in our midst that is not entirely comprehensible, but which requires martialing our best knowledge, our longheld principles of right and wrong, law, and justice, and our deepest sense of compassion. If anything is clear, it is that we have yet to find satisfactory answers.

For this reason it is important to resist the inclination to supply simple explanations or quick fix-solutions. We must at once condemn violent behavior by children or anyone else, but also strive to prevent it. Historically, condemnation has proven very easy, while prevention has remained elusive.

As we attempt to increase our knowledge about violence, however, it is important to remember that the attacks and killings that receive the most attention from the media and the public are not the typical incidents of violence. If we are serious about reducing violence, we must attend to the less sensational, daily incidents that take place outside of television spotlights.

Our witnesses today include noted leaders in law enforcement and the judicial system, criminologists, public health officials, psychiatrists and educators. They come from the communities which have directly and recently experienced the incidents now well known around the nation and the world. We will learn not only of the increases in violent behavior by youth but that four factors—poverty, abuse as a child, witnessing family violence, and substance abuse—increase the risk that a child will later become a victimizer. We welcome them to the Committee, and look forward to their ability to assist the Congress and the public to better understand this deeply disturbing national crisis.

"Down These Mean Streets:
Violence By and Against America's Children"

A FACT SHEET

HOMICIDE, SUICIDE LEADING CAUSES OF YOUTH DEATH

** Between 1985 and 1986, the U.S. homicide rate increased 17% for 15-24 year olds and 8% for the general population. There were 21,731 homicide victims in 1986, 6,561 of whom were under age 25. (National Center for Health Statistics [NCHS], 1988)

** Homicide is the second leading cause of death for 15-24 year olds in the U.S, claiming 5,552 lives in this age range in 1986. Only motor vehicle accidents claimed more lives. It is the fourth leading cause of death for 1-4 and 5-14 year olds. (NCHS, 1988)

** For black 15- to 24-year olds, homicide is the leading cause of death, claiming 2,644 victims in 1986, or nearly 50 per 100,000 in this population. It is the second and third leading cause of death for black 1-4 years olds and black 5-14 year olds. (NCHS, 1988)

** Three-quarters of homicide victims are male; 82% of homicides are committed by males. (NCHS, 1988; Unified Crime Reports, Federal Bureau of Investigation [UCR], 1988)

** 80% of homicides occur between members of the same race. (Centers for Disease Control [CDC], 1986)

** Compared with 13 industrialized nations studied, the United States had the second highest homicide rate for males aged 0-24 years, and the highest rate for females in the same age range. Only Mexico had a higher homicide rate among males. The U.S. rate for 15-24 year old males was more than 5 times higher than the 11 other nations. Among 15-24 year old females, the U.S. homicide rate is more than 10 times greater than the rates in Japan, Norway, and the United Kingdom. (Census, 1989, unpublished)

** Suicide is the third leading cause of death among youth ages 15-24, claiming 5,120 youths' lives in 1986. Between 1970 and

1980, the suicide rate among 15-24 year olds increased 40%, while the rate for the remainder of the population remained stable. (CDC, 1986)

TEENAGERS DISPROPORTIONATELY VICTIMS OF VIOLENT CRIME

** From 1982 through 1984, teenagers ages 12-19 were the victims of 1.8 million violent crimes annually, twice the rate of the adult population over age 20. (Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS], 1986)

** Of all age groups, teens ages 16-19 have the highest victimization rate for violent crimes (excluding homicide). Teens ages 12-15 have the third highest rate. (BJS, 1986)

** Among victims of violent crimes, older teens are more likely than the general population to be attacked by strangers. Younger teens are more likely to be attacked by non-strangers. (BJS, 1987)

VIOLENT CRIME BY JUVENILES INCREASING

** Violent crime, especially by juveniles, has been increasing since 1983. Between 1983 and 1987, the number of juveniles (under 18) arrested for murder increased 22.2% to 1,495. Forcible-rape arrests increased 14.6% to 4,604; and aggravated-assault arrests increased 18.6% to 36,006. Over the same period, the number of juveniles arrested for robbery and burglary declined by 19.2% and 14.6%, respectively (UCR, 1988)

** Between 1986 and 1987, the number of juveniles under age 15 arrested for murder increased 21.7% to 191; for rape 5.2% to 1,600; and for aggravated assault 4.4% to 10,767. (UCR, 1988)

** A study of young parolees found a 69% recidivism (rearrest) rate. The study found no relationship between recidivism and the length of time served in prison by parolees for their previous offenses. Recidivism rates were highest among parolees with the most previous arrests. (BJS, 1987)

** Four out of five juveniles confined in long-term, State-operated juvenile institutions report previously having been on probation; more than half report having been committed to a correctional institution in the past. (BJS, 1988)

YOUTH IN CUSTODY HAVE LOWER LEVELS OF EDUCATION; MORE LIKELY TO HAVE GROWN UP WITHOUT BOTH PARENTS

** Only about 42% of juveniles and young adults in juvenile detention, correctional, and shelter facilities have completed more than 8 years of school, compared to 76% of the general population in this age group. Among those age 18-24 in these facilities, fewer than a tenth have graduated from high school, compared to 79% of this age group in the general population. (BJS, 1988)

** More than half of all juveniles and young adults in juvenile institutions reported that a family member had served time in jail or prison. A quarter of the residents reported that their fathers had been incarcerated at some time in the past. (BJS, 1988)

DELINQUENCY STRONGLY CORRELATED TO CHILD ABUSE AND FAMILY VIOLENCE

** In a study of delinquents and nondelinquents, a history of abuse and/or family violence was the most significant variable in predicting membership in the delinquent group. Compared to their nondelinquent peers, delinquent adolescents were also more likely to suffer subtle forms of neurological impairment and severe psychiatric symptoms, and to have learning disabilities. (Lewis, et al, 1987).

** Studies of juveniles sentenced to death in the U.S. indicate that these youth are multiply handicapped; they tend to have suffered serious head injuries, injuries to the central nervous system, multiple psychotic symptoms since early childhood, and physical and sexual abuse. (Lewis, et al, 1986; Lewis, 1987)

** Delinquent juveniles, particularly institutionalized delinquent juveniles have significantly higher rates of child abuse than the general youth population. Among institutionalized juvenile offenders, 26-55% have official histories of child abuse. (Austin, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Testimony before the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, May 1984)

CHILD ABUSE FATALITIES AND OVERALL MALTREATMENT ON THE RISE

** Between 1982 and 1987, the national rate at which children are reported for abuse and neglect increased 69.2% from 20 to 34 children reported per 1000 U.S. children. Missouri, Nevada, South Dakota, and California all had rates of more than 50 children reported per thousand children in the population. (The American Humane Association, 1989)

** Over 2.2 million child abuse reports were filed in 1988, up 3% from 1987, and 1,225 children were reported to have died from abuse or neglect in 1988, a 5% increase from the year before. Nonetheless, the majority of states made no increase in their child welfare budgets, forcing most states to cut back on child protection workers and services for victims. (National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse [NCPCA], 1989)

** Two-thirds of the states that responded to a recent national survey cited parental substance abuse as the dominant characteristic among their child abuse and neglect caseloads. (NCPCA, 1989)

INCREASING NUMBERS OF YOUTHS KILLED BY FIREARMS

** Between 1984 and 1986, the number of 15-24 year olds killed by firearms in the U.S. increased more than 16 percent from 6,765 to 7,852. Among black males in this age range, firearm fatalities increased more than 20%. (NCHS, 1988)

** In 1987, 43.7% of homicide victims under the age of 18 were killed by firearms. (UCR, 1988)

** Firearms were used in most suicides of 10-14 and 15-24 year olds. (Waller, et al, 1989; CDC, 1986)

OVERALL DRUG USE BY YOUTH DECLINING

** Overall drug usage, including cocaine and "crack" use, among high school seniors declined between 1987 and 1988, although 57% had tried an illicit drug at some time and over one-third had tried an illicit drug other than marijuana. (This survey

does not include measures for the 15-20% of the age group who did not finish high school.) (Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1989)

** An estimated 30% of arrested juveniles in the District of Columbia, 49% in Maricopa County (Phoenix), Arizona, 44% in San Diego, California (only males tested), and 35% in Tampa, Florida, test positive for illicit drug use. (District of Columbia Pretrial Services Agency [DCPSA], 1989; Treatment Assessment Screening Center, Phoenix, Arizona, 1989; U.S. Department of Justice, 1989)

** Cocaine use among arrested juveniles in the District of Columbia increased from a negligible number in 1984 to 23% in 1988. Between 1987 and 1988, overall illicit drug use has declined among juvenile arrestees, except for the youngest ages. Between 1987 and 1988, illicit drug use by 12 year old arrestees increased from 6% to 14%, by 13 year old arrestees from 9% to 21%, and by 14 year old arrestees from 17% to 20%. (DCPSA, 1988-89)

May 1989

I would like at this time to recognize Congresswoman Barbara Boxer for any comments she may have.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, very briefly. I want to thank you for holding this hearing on your birthday. It's not a happy birthday subject. But, as usual, you're right on the mark in terms of your leadership of this committee.

We are losing too many of our children to drugs, to gangs, and to crime. Once a country loses its kids, it really is going to lose its future. So I think that today's hearing and the other hearings that you conduct, and the leadership you have shown in this Congress towards bringing home our kids, is extremely important. I am very pleased to be here with you this morning.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you.

I would like to welcome to the committee Congressman Charles Hayes of Illinois. Charlie, do you have any comments you would like to make?

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to briefly join your committee, to introduce one of your witnesses, my constituent, Dr. Carl Bell.

I would like to first commend you and the committee for your excellent work on children and family issues. We in the Congress are certainly in need of supportive data which your committee provides to help sustain needed programs for our Nation's children, youth and families.

However, I am here today for the specific purpose of introducing my constituent, Dr. Carl Bell of Chicago, IL. Dr. Bell was one of the founders, and since 1987 has been executive director, of the Community Mental Health Council in Chicago. The Community Mental Health Council has provided mental health services to five communities in my district on the south side of the City of Chicago since 1974.

As a native Chicagoan, Dr. Bell completed his undergraduate degree at the University of Illinois and subsequently his medical degree at Meharry School of Medicine in Nashville, TN. Having extensively studied the issue of violence, Dr. Bell has produced some 60 publications and over 20 articles. Additionally, Dr. Bell served on the faculty of the University of Illinois, the University of Chicago, and at the Chicago Medical School. He is also nationally known as a lecturer and consultant on the issues of homicide and violence.

I am certain that Dr. Bell will provide your committee with significant data as it relates to violence among our Nation's youth, and I am again pleased to take this time out to greet my fellow Chicagoan, Dr. Bell. Thank you for being here today.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, I will not be able to stay for the duration of the hearing. I will have to depart momentarily. But I want to take this time to again thank you for this opportunity to join you today.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you very much.

Congressman Bliley.

Mr. BLILEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The treasure of youth is being spent and robbed by violence. Today, the modern world is indicted by its handiwork—the domestic terrorism of drugs, child abuse, abortion, pornography and gang

warfare, these forms of violence are not worthy of a civilized nation and threaten to bring us to unprecedented self-destruction.

The conscience of our nation is deeply troubled by the alarming violence among our children. Homicide represents 14 percent of all deaths among adolescents and young adults, ages 15 to 24, and 17 percent of infant deaths. The homicide rate for youth and young adults is 58 percent higher than for the population in general, and 12 times higher than for children ages 5 to 14. Eighty-three percent of 12 year olds will be victims of crime within their lifetimes.

We are also troubled by our apparent lack of success in dealing with violent offenders. Nearly half of "ever violent" offenders have been arrested six or more times. Nearly two-thirds of young violent offenders are rearrested within six years.

We should not simply recite numbers as if violence can be looked at within a vacuum. There are a number of factors which are related to violence. The relationship between drugs and crime and pornography and crime are inescapable. One out of every five juveniles in custody for violent offenses has prior convictions for drug offenses. Forty-five percent of juveniles incarcerated for violent offenses were under the influence of drugs or alcohol at the time of their offense. Studies of rapists indicate that a vast majority regularly consumed pornography, with 57 percent admitting actual imitation in the commission of their rape.

If we are to reduce serious juvenile crime, potential offenders must know that punishment will be certain and severe. It is all too apparent that juvenile offenders neither respect society nor fear the risk of law enforcement. Even worse, juvenile offenders often are just beginning a lifetime of violence. The median age at first arrest for prison inmates incarcerated for a current and prior violent offense is just 15.

We also know there is a strong relationship between family breakdown and violent crime. Violence on the streets cannot be separated from what is happening in the home. Part of our prevention strategy must be directed toward the living room, the classroom, and the work room, as well as the courtroom, to provide our young people with the strong families and role models they need.

Government cannot escape some of the blame for the disruption of family life. While the wellspring of human progress as we know it has depended upon the individual freely following the moral law of responsibility and self-restraint, the principles of morality have been distorted in the last half of the 20th century, often by Government itself. One of the grave consequences of these "family policies" is family dissolution, which is all too often followed by violence by and against our youth.

We must be concerned not only with the most violent of crimes which pierce our hearts and enrage our sensibilities. For the victim, our concern comes too late. It may be a long fuse which was lit well before the explosion. No, we must be watchful all along the way to prevent the violence from ever happening.

It is the little things which turn out to have so great an impact in forming young lives, a steady diet of encouragement and direction that must be given daily to our young people to help them grow and learn to respect the dignity of each person, starting with one's self.

In sum, we see again that the most powerful influences for change must begin in the home and at the community level. I hope that today, we will hear some of the ways in which Government can help bring about these changes.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF VIRGINIA, AND RANKING REPUBLICAN MEMBER

The treasure of youth is being spent and robbed by violence. Today, the modern world is indicted by its handiwork—the domestic terrorism of drugs, child abuse, abortion, pornography and gang warfare. These forms of violence are not worthy of a civilized nation and threaten to bring us to unprecedented self-destruction.

The conscience of our nation is deeply troubled by the alarming violence among our children:

Homicide represents 14 percent of all deaths among adolescents and young adults, ages 15 to 24, and 17 percent of infant deaths.

The homicide rate for youth and young adults is 58 percent higher than for the population in general, and 12 times higher than for children ages 5 to 14. According to the most recent health statistics, murder is the leading cause of death among young black men. From 1970 to 1984, the homicide rate for young black men declined; but since 1984, it has risen by 29 percent.

Eighty-three percent of 12 year olds will be victims of crime within their lifetimes.

Teenagers make up the hightest category of rape victims.

Juvenile prostitution is estimated to range from 100,000 to 200,000 children. Many of them are victims of violence as well as exploitation.

We are also troubled by our apparent lack of success in dealing with violent offenders.

Nearly half of "ever violent" offenders have been arrested six or more times.

Nearly two-thirds of young violent offenders are rearrested within 6 years.

We should not simply recite numbers as if violence can be looked at within a vacuum. There are a number of factors which are related to violence. The relationship between drugs and crime and pornography and crime are inescapable. One out of every five juveniles in custody for violent offenses has prior convictions for drug offenses. Forty-five percent of juveniles incarcerated for violent offenses were under the influence of drugs or alcohol at the time of their offense. Studies of rapists indicate that a vast majority regularly consume pornography with 57 percent admitting actual imitation in the commission of their rape.

If we are to reduce serious juvenile crime, potential offenders must know that punishment will be certain and severe. It is all too apparent that juvenile offenders neither respect society nor fear the risk of law enforcement. Even worse, juvenile offenders often are just beginning a lifetime of violence. The median age at first arrest for prison inmates incarcerated for a current and prior violent offense is just 15.

We also know there is a strong relationship between family breakdown and violent crime. Violence on the streets cannot be separated from what is happening in the home. Part of our prevention strategy must be directed toward the living room, the classroom, and the workroom, as well as the courtroom, to provide our young people with the strong families and role models they need.

Government cannot escape some of the blame for the disruption of family life. While the wellspring of human progress as we know it has depended upon the individual freely following the moral law of responsibility and self-restraint, the principles of morality have been distorted in the last half of the 20th century, often by Government itself. Changes in the law have cleared the path for a man to easily leave his wife and children in poverty; we reward the breakdown, or more precisely, the failure to form a family through government assistance programs; inequitable tax burdens coax both parents out of the home; public programs entice children to explore new rights before they are ready to use them wisely; all of these have been done without the necessary vision to see the undersirable consequences. And one of the grave consequences of these "family policies" is family dissolution, which is all too often followed by violence by and against our youth.

While these changes to the moral code may be part of the "modern" family, they should not be considered progressive. In 1970, there 3.8 million single-parent families. Today, there are 9.2 million families missing a parent. Can we consider ourselves to be progressing as a civilizaton in light of the violence which threatens our

homes, our schools, and indeed the most fundamental right to life? These are not just personal, isolated acts, they spill over to affect entire families and communities.

Children are imitators, they act out what they have learned. We hope that they will imitate the positive aspects of our lives; can we truly be shocked when they imitate the negative ones?

We must be concerned not only with the most violent of crimes which pierce our hearts and enrage our sensibilities. For the victim, our concern comes too late. It may be a long fuse which was lit well before the explosion. No, we must be watchful all along the way to prevent the violence from ever happening—it is the little things which turn out to have so great an impact in forming young lives—a steady diet of encouragement and direction that must be given daily to our young people to help them grow and learn to respect the dignity of each person, starting with one's self.

In sum, we see again that the most powerful influences for change must begin in the home and at the community level. I hope that today, we will hear some of the ways in which Government can help bring about these changes.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you.

Congressman Rowland?

Mr. ROWLAND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In looking over this fact sheet that you have given us, it certainly is distressing and disquieting to realize so many of our young people are involved in violent crime and so many of them lose their lives at an early age. One wonders why this takes place, why does this happen, and what can we do about it.

I look forward to hearing the testimony this morning and certainly hope there will be some solutions brought forth to this problem that affects our society so severely. Thank you for focusing on this problem, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you.

Okay. We will hear from our first panel, which will be made up of Dr. Carl Bell, who is the Director of the Community Mental Health Council in Chicago, IL; Dr. Howard Spivak, who is the Deputy Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Public Health; the Honorable Reggie B. Walton, Associate Judge, Superior Court of the District of Columbia, and nominee for Associate Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy; Deborah Meier, who is the Principal of Central Park East Secondary School, New York City; and Gregory A. Loken, who is the Executive Director of Covenant House, Institute for Youth Advocacy, New York City.

Welcome to the committee. We will take your testimony in the order in which I called your name. Dr. Bell, we will start with you.

All of your written testimony, if you have it, will be placed in the record in its entirety. To the extent you can summarize, we would appreciate it. But proceed in a manner in which you're most comfortable.

Welcome, Dr. Bell.

STATEMENT OF CARL C. BELL, M.D., DIRECTOR, COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH COUNCIL, SOUTHSIDE, CHICAGO, IL, APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, DC

Dr. BELL. Thank you.

I am Dr. Carl Bell, here representing the American Psychiatric Association. I work on the south side of Chicago, as Congressman Hayes has already mentioned, in a neighborhood of 200,000 people.

I am here to talk about the issue of violence and how it impacts on children.

Clearly, the problem is a national one. Homicide is currently the leading cause of death in black males 15 to 44, and the leading cause of death in black males 15 to 34. If you consider that there were less than 6,000 black men killed during the whole 12 years of the Vietnam war, you will quickly realize that there have been several years in this country in which there were more black men killed in this country by other black men than the whole 12 years of the Vietnam war.

The homicide rates has been like this since 1929, so it is really nothing new at all. I've been dealing with the problem for some time.

Now, I want to take that from a national perspective and bring it down locally to where I operate. We did a survey of 536 children in an elementary school in my neighborhood, my catchment area. Twenty-six percent of these children had seen a shooting and 29 percent had seen a stabbing. We then went into the mentally ill population and found that four percent of the men who were coming to us as patients had been raped, and a third of the women had been raped. Forty percent of both men and women had been physically assaulted.

Troutman, a friend of mine upon Milwaukee, replicated the same sort of a study and found that 30 percent of the men and 50 percent of the women had been raped, and 56 percent of the men and 66 percent of the women had been assaulted. Of all these populations, about a fourth of them know someone personally who has been murdered. So it's a real serious problem.

When we looked at the mentally ill who had been victimized, we found that they had been victimized repeatedly. For example, 25 percent of that one-third of the women who had been raped, 25 percent had been raped as children and again as adults. Excuse me if I get a little bit angry. I don't like this. I'm sorry. I deal with this every day and it gets to be kind of rough.

We went into the medically ill population and found that 14 percent of the women had been raped, and again 36 percent of the men and 15 percent of the women had been assaulted.

We have done surveys now of about a thousand students, 65 percent high school and 35 percent elementary school. 39 percent have seen a shooting, 34 percent have seen a stabbing, and 23 percent have seen a homicide. 23 percent of these children have seen a homicide.

Bradwell School last year is a classic example of what I face daily. About a week before a homicide occurred at Bradwell School, the woman up in Winetka went into the area and shot these six kids, killing one of them. Within 45 minutes in Winetka, the Evanston crisis team was on the scene dealing with that community. A week later an elementary kid was shot and killed and no crisis team came. After the funeral, when everybody was sort of falling apart, the school social worker found out about it three or four days after the funeral. So it was about five or six days later. There weren't enough resources to deal with those kids.

I think what happened in Winetka was very appropriate, but I can show you areas on the south side of Chicago where something

like that happens all the time and there is no such response. It's a problem.

The social worker from Chicago contacted me, because she had heard about the work I was doing. She was seeing six children with behavioral and learning problems individually, for psychotherapy, to try to help the kids get straight. She found out, as she saw these kids, that all six of them had learning and behavioral problems because they had witnessed a homicide. So I guess what I'm saying is, and what we need to consider, is that a lot of the educational problems and behavioral disturbances that I see in young black children on the south side of Chicago may very well be due to them having been witness to violence and suffering from post traumatic stress disorder, similar to what Vietnam veterans suffer from. She found out that this occurred and she put all these six kids in a group.

This is nothing unique to Chicago. I've got people in Los Angeles, in Atlanta, who tell me the same thing. Batchelor and Wicks found out that in 1985 there were about 300 children in Detroit who witnessed the death of their parents through homicide. Now, if you go to Detroit and ask them what their public policy is around dealing with the problem of violence, they don't have one. Neither do many other cities. So it's a very serious problem.

Let me just very briefly, because I don't want to commit "congressional violence" by talking too much——

Chairman MILLER. Only we can do that.

Dr. BELL [continuing]. Let me just give you some quick solutions. These are all in the report and you might refer to them.

There are a lot of myths around who's killing who. Some people think it's the police, some people think it's the criminal. Most homicides are family/friend homicides. You have got to destroy those myths.

There are racial issues that people are concerned about. When I've gone nationally to talk to people, it strikes me that, unfortunately, white people think that if black people stop killing black people, they will start killing white people. So there is sort of a selective inattention to the black homicide issue, which as I said has been going on since 1929.

The development of grassroots community efforts. Violence prevention curriculums which Dr. Prothrow-Stith has developed are very useful in public schools. Having conflict resolution teams in public housing is a very useful thing, but a lot of people block it. There's a Judge Cumerford in Chicago who is blocking that effort because he thinks it will divert the juvenile justice system or the criminal justice system, which I don't understand because it works here in D.C.

Vocational services for teenagers. There are studies on head injury that indicate head injury and violence are related. Screening in emergency rooms is very useful. Mental health centers having victimization programs is useful, but a lot of times those are blocked because the victims' program tends to be dominated by white women feminists, and when you start a victimization program at a mental health center, they get righteously and reasonably concerned that we're going to stigmatize victims, which we are

not going to do. But there is some political mess around that that needs clarity.

Case finding and correctional facilities. I think the Attorney General's Task Force on Family Violence should be taken off the shelf, because I think it is on the shelf in some communities. There are some very useful things in there as well.

We have got to start dealing with the co-victims, because a lot of people living in sort of war zones are suffering from combat fatigue and nobody has been paying any attention.

There are a lot of other things I could say, because usually I talk for a few hours, but I will be quiet at this point and be available for any questions you might have.

[Prepared statement of Carl C. Bell, MD., follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CARL C. BELL, M.D., COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH COUNCIL, SOUTHSIDE, CHICAGO, IL

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am Carl C. Bell, M.D., a practicing psychiatrist with the Southside Chicago, Illinois, Community Mental Health Council, and a member of the American Psychiatric Association's Committee of Black Psychiatrists. I am pleased to appear before the Committee to represent the views and concerns of the American Psychiatric Association, a medical specialty society representing over 35,000 psychiatrists nationwide.

The purpose of this testimony is to outline the problem of family violence and the problems children may have who are victims of or witnesses to this violence. In addition, solutions to the problem will be suggested. The majority of the observations presented are the result of empirical work done at the Community Mental Health Council, a comprehensive community mental health center located on the south side of Chicago serving a predominately Black community.

The Problem

In 1986, Blacks accounted for 44% of the murder victims in the United States, and, as in previous years, more than 90% of those Black victims were slain by Black offenders; yet Blacks comprised only about 12% of the population, (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1987). Black-on-Black murder is the leading cause of death in Black males 15 to 44 and the leading cause of death in Black females 15 to 34. Black men have a 1 in 21 chance of becoming a homicide victim, Black women have a 1 in 104 chance; White men have a 1 in 131 chance of being a homicide victim, and White women have a 1 in 369 chance, (Secretary's Task Force on Black and Minority Health, 1985).

Further, since less than 6,000 Black men were killed during the entire Vietnam War, there have been several single years during which there were more Black men killed in this country than killed during that entire war.

From 1976 to 1983, Black homicide victims knew their assailant in 59.8% of the homicides which occurred during those years. Among Black males, homicide victims knew their assailants in 58.3% of the cases and over three-fourths of those men who knew their assailants knew them as friends or acquaintances. Black female victims knew their assailant in 65.8% of the cases, and in 43.8% of those homicides the assailants was a family member, (Centers for Disease Control, 1986). Related to the fact that most victims and offenders knew each other is the fact that most often the homicide was classified as a primary homicide (64.8%), i.e., a homicide not related to any other felony, but one which usually occurred during a non-felony circumstance such as an argument. To make matters worse is the finding that for every one homicide there are 100 assaults, (Rosenberg & Mercy, 1986).

When one considers the years of potential life lost from homicide; the cost of days lost from work, school or other meaningful activities; the cost of the disabilities resulting from violence; and the devastating emotional impact of violence - the true damage to society can be begun to be appreciated. It is clear, for example, that battered women suffer more frequently from general medical problems and psychological symptoms of stress such as suicide attempts, alcoholism, drug abuse, and depression (Stark & Flitcraft, 1982). Family violence is often cited as the major reason for divorce and can be thought of as a destructive force eating away

at the American family. The full effects on children of witnessing such violence is unknown, but many of the children who witness violence suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder and have many other behavioral disturbances in childhood and adult life.

In order to gain a better appreciation of how the above national statistics on violence impacted on the community it served, the Community Mental Health Council (CMHC) began to do a number of field surveys in its community.

The first of the surveys was performed on 536 elementary school children from CMHC's catchment area and revealed that 26% reported having seen someone shot and 29% had seen a stabbing, (Jenkins and Thompson, 1986). Looking at the Council's mentally ill population we learned that 4% of the men and 1/3 of the women had been raped; 40% of the men and women had been physically assaulted; and 1/4 of both the men and women knew of someone who had been murdered, (Bell et al., 1988). Similar findings were reported by Troutman and Braunstein (1989) in a part of the Milwaukee County Mental Health complex that serves a predominately poor, African-American population. This study found that 30% of the men and 50% of the women had been raped; 56% of the men and 66% of the women had been physically assaulted, and 30% of the men and 42% of the women knew of someone who had been murdered. A more in-depth study of a representative sample of CMHC's victimized mentally ill population revealed that a large proportion of these patients' physical and sexual assaults were perpetrated by friends and family. Furthermore, many of these patients reported being multiply victimized. For example, 25% of the women who reported being raped had been raped both as children, and, then again as adults, (Jenkins, et al., 1989).

In looking at the medically ill population in a poor west side Chicago community, it was learned that 14% of the women reported having been raped; 15% of the women and 36% of the men reported having been assaulted; and 28% of the women and 46% of the men reported of knowing someone who was murdered.

Community Mental Health Council Victims Services staff have continued to go to several community high school and elementary school classes and have currently surveyed over 1,000 students (65% in high shcool and 35% in elementary school). Thirty-nine percent reported seeing a shooting, 34% a stabbing, and 23% seeing a murder, (Shakoor, et al., 1989).

After a local school social worker contacted CMHC about her work with children in one of the schools we'd surveyed, the problem took even a sharper focus. Dyson (1989), was individually referred to six children from the same class of 33 for intervention in their behavior problems and poor academic performance. Her individual interviews revealed histories of extensive family violence resulting in a murder of a close family member. Her article illustrates the severity of violence inner-city school children are faced with which drastically interferes with the normal learning process. She notes that an overwhelming number of inner-city children experience major losses by death of a close family member yet remain unassisted in working through the mourning process, and, further, that aggression (in the form of violence) may represent this unresolved grief. Her interventions were able to help the six children referred to make improvements in their behavioral and academic performance.

Thus, we have empirical evidence of how the broader national violence statistics have a specific effect in the community, local schools, and individuals. Clearly, the exposure to violence increases the potential for future violence and hinders emotional and intellectual development of children exposed to violence. These empirical-Chicago based findings have been supported by other psychiatrists and researchers around the country. For example, Dr. Quinton James, a psychiatrist at the Augustus F. Hawkins Mental Health Services in Los Angeles, has informed me that in looking at 132 consecutive intakes of children to the center, 13 (10%) had a chief complaint of being witness to homicide. An examination of one-half of the homicide cases in Detroit in 1985 found that 17% were witnessed by a total of 136 youths ages 18 and younger, (Batchelor & Wick, 1985). Of the 2,000 homicides in Los Angeles County in 1982, 10% were witnessed by a dependent youngster (Pynoos & Eth, 1985). Pynoos and Eth (1985b) asserts that "intrusive imagery from violence within the family and its associated affect, markedly interferes with the child's ability to learn." Finally, Lewis, (1985) has identified being witness to or victim of violence as a factor associated with children who later murder; thus, violence may well begat violence in some children.

Solutions to the Problem

The solutions to the problems have been fully discussed elsewhere (Bell, 1987; Bell, 1988: Bell, in press) and will not be discussed here. Rather, an outline of solutions which fit various aspects of the multifactorial problem of violence in society will be given.

1. There are a number of myths and misconceptions about who's killing who and why. Many of these misconceptions are fueled by media which tend to focus on the sensational and exceptional rather than the common place. Thus, many Blacks think it's White policemen who have killed the majority of Blacks; many people fear being killed by a burglar when their chances of being murdered by a family member, friend, or acquaintance are much higher; many are afraid of being killed by gangs in the midst of drug trade wars when (in the vast majority of cities) homicides resulting from interpersonal altercations still outnumber gang-related homicides. These myths need to be replaced by facts in a national media educational campaign. Facts such as "loaded gun kept in the home for homeowner protection from a home invader is 118 times more likely to kill a family member of friend," or that when home ownership of guns increased by five times in Detroit (due to homeowners buying guns to protect themselves after the 1969 riots), the homicide rate went from about 100 per year to 700 per year - the vast majority due to interpersonal altercations. Another myth is that homicides are due to instrumental violence, i.e., violence used to acquire goods which occurs in a robbery, when in fact most are due to expressive violence as a result of interpersonal altercations. This myth prevents the criminal justice system from accepting the part of violence in society it can impact and prevents the public health, educational, and legislative systems from taking rsponsibility for the aspects of violence they can influence. Consciousness on this issue must be raised.

2. There is a great deal of confusion about the fact that different ethnic groups, different cities, and different times have different dynamics of violence. For example, Hispanic men do not tend to kill Hispanic women; there is a disproportionate percentage of Black domestic homicides, etc. Thus, cities must not generalize their prevention strategies to violence based on which city has the most press on violence as each city' homicide dynamic is different. City's must tailor make their programs to fit their situations.

3. There is a lack of research on acquired biologic causes of violence such as head injury or how alcohol may cause central nervous system imbalances that promote violence. Most of these studies have been done on low risk populations, and finding a critical mass of cases to make a solid connectoin between acquired biology and violence is lacking. Related to this is the possibility that certain medications, like propranolol, may in fact, be an anti-violence drug, but has not been approved by the FDA for these indications. Such medications have been shown to significantly reduce violence in head injured individuals. It should further be noted that

Blacks and other minorities are twice more likely to suffer head injury that may promote violence.

4. There continue to be racial concerns on the part of both Blacks, Hispanics, and Whites around the issue of violence. Blacks are concerned that Whites will interpret their higher homicide rates as evidence of genetic inferiority rather than the effects of poverty. Whites are afraid that if Blacks stop killing Blacks they'll start killing Whites. These fears must be combated by exposing them to the light of awareness.

5. Institutional racism must be confronted to prevent continued systematic road blocks to the problem. For example suicide (a problem that is 2 to 3 times more common in Whites) was responded to by multiple state legislative initiatives, but homicide (a problem that is 5.6 times more common in Blacks and 2 to 3 times higher in Hispanics) does not receive such legislative favor. Another example can be found in the vigorous community response to a White woman visiting violence at a White Chicago suburban shcool compared to the apathy that is found when a Black child is killed in front of his class on Chicago's predominately Black south side.

6. Community development must be done. For example, if, as Dyson (1989) suggests, school children who have academic and behavioral problems are screened for having witnessed violence, then who will help those kids overcome their stress? The teachers and school guidance counselors will have to go back to school to learn how to address such issues. This is community development, i.e. developing services in the community to cope with the problem.

7. Grass roots community efforts need support, e.g. Save Our Sons and Daughters in Detroit, Black-on-Black Love Campaign in Chicago, etc. These programs appear to have the potential for successfully impacting on the problem of violence.

8. Curricula that teach kids conflict resolution skills should be taught in public schools. The same is true for family violence prevention curricula.

9. Conflict resolution centers like the OSAY Program in Washington, D.C. housing developments need to be encouraged and supported throughout the country.

10. Vocational services for teens have been shown to be able to dissuade kids from involving themselves in the dangerous, violent illegitimate economies.

11. Neuropsychiatric stimulation for infants. Along with current efforts to address nutritional and prenatal care

needs, as well as programs designed to upgrade the health status of mothers, a national campaign needs to be begun for all infants to be rocked as rocking enhances brain development which reduces potential for future violence.

12. Prevention of free falls and children being hit by cars need to be undertaken in poor communities as such head injury has been associated with violence.

13. Studies on the connection between alcohol abuse and neurochemical alterations in the brain causing explosive, impulsive violence need to be encouraged in minority populations that have high cirrhosis of the liver death rates. The results of these studies need to be widely disseminated to discourage drinking.

14. Ethnic pride needs to be stimulated and the difference between desegregation and integration needs to be clearly understood as it has been shown that a solid sense of ethnic identity "immunizes" people against drug abuse, suicide, and likely violence.

15. Secondary prevention methods such as screening for battered women in general medical settings could identify women at risk and refer them for services to address their issues of violence, i.e. women shelters. Gynecologists need to have handbooks for battered women in their offices.

16. Family therapists and mental health workers need better training on how to do family therapy for violent families.

17. Clergy need to be encouraged to get involved, identify families of violence not just in their congregation but in the community and reach out to those families with church-based services, e.g. counseling, respite and shelters.

18. School boards need to study Pynoos and Nader's paper (1988) which offers a blueprint on how to handle children exposed to community violence.

19. Mental health centers need to recognize the high percentages of victims in their population and offer victims' services.

20. Case findings in correctional facilities needs to be undertaken to identify victims and perpetrators of violence, and provide them with treatment.

21. The Attorney General's Task Force Report (1984) needs to be reread and actualized by local officials. It clearly outlines the roles the criminal justice system can play

in reducing homicide and family violence.

22. Finally, tertiary prevention needs to be begun. For example, unfortunately many cities lack meaningful public policy on what to do with a child who witnesses a homicide. Co-victims of family homicide victims need services.

Conclusions

The problem of violence takes an exceedingly high toll on society, families and individuals. Based on over 15 years of research and direct clinical work in this area, I'm convinced there are systemic solutions that can alleviate the problem of what I refer to as "survival fatigue", e.g., the stress of surviving in a milieu of violence which is similar to the "combat fatigue" observed in war. An excellent example of such a remedy can be found in The Year 2000 Health Objectives currently being drafted by the U.S. Public Health Service. I can only hope that the nation doesn't make the same mistake Washington, D.C. made around the problem of violence, i.e., as long as violence was only a public health issue it didn't get major attention from other government resources, but when it became a political problem (i.e., when D.C. became the murder capital of the U.S.) attention was drawn and an effort to address the problem finally began.

REFERENCES

Attorney General's Task Force on Family Violence. Report of the Attorney General's Task Force on Family Violence; Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, 1984.

Batchelor J, Wicks N. Study of children and youth as witness to homicide, city of Detroit; Unpublished paper.

Bell CC (1987). Preventive Strategies for dealing with violence among Blacks. Community Mental Health Journal; 23: 217-228.

Bell CC (1988). Preventing Homicide. Psychiatric Times 5, ρ 1, 36-38.

Bell, CC, Taylor-Crawford K, Jenkins EJ, & Chalmers D (1988). Need for Victimization Screening in a Black Psychiatric Population. J Natl Med Assoc; 80: 41-48.

Bell CC, Hildreth CJ, Jenkins EJ, Levi D, Carter C (1988). The Need for Victimization Screening in a Poor Outpatient Medical Population; J Natl Med Assoc; 80: 853-860.

Bell CC. "Black-on-Black Homicide: The Implications for Black Community Mental Health" in Mental Health and Mental Illness Among Black Americans, edited by Smith-Ruiz D. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press; in press.

Centers for Disease Control. Homicide Surveillance: High-Risk Racial and Ethnic Groups - Blacks and Hispanics 1970 to 1983. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control, 1986.

Dyson JL. Family Violence and Its Effect on Children's Academic Under-Achievement and Behavior Problems in Schools. J Natl Med Assoc; in press.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. Crime in the United States 1986. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, 1987.

Jenkins EJ, Bell CC, Taylor J. Walker L (1989). Circumstances and Impact of Sexual and Physical Victimization on Psychiatric Outpatients. J Natl Med Assoc; 81: 246-252.

Jenkins EJ, Thompson B (1986). Children Talk About Violence: Preliminary Findings From a Survey of Black Elementary School Children. Paper presented at the Nineteenth Annual Convention of Associaton of Black Psychologists; Oakland, CA.

Lewis DO, Moy E, Jackson LD (1985). Biopsychosocial Characteristics of Children Who Later Murder: A Prospective Study. Am J Psychiatry; 142: 1161-1167.

Pynoos R, Eth S (1985). The Child As Witness To Homicide. J Social Issues; 125: 613-617.

Pynoos RS, Eth S (1985b). Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder in Children, Children Traumatized by Witnessing Acts of Personal Violence: Homicide, Rape, or Suicide Behavior. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press, pp 19-37.

Pynoos RS, Nader K (1988). A Psychological First Aid and Treatment Approach to Children Exposed to Community Violence: Research Implications. J Traumatic Stress 1, 445-473.

Rosenberg ML, Mercy JA (1986). Homicide: Epidemiologic Analysis at the National Level. Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine; 62: 376-399.

Secretary's Task Force on Black and Minority Health. Report of the Secretary's Task Force on Black and Minority Health, Vol 1: Executive Summary. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, DHHS Publication Number (PHS) 0-487-637, Government Printing Office, 1985.

Shakoor B, Chalmers D, Uhara. The Need for Co-Victimization Screening in an Inner-City School Population. in press.

Stark E, Flitcraft A (1982). Medical Therapy As Repression: The Case of the Battered Woman. Health and Medicine; Summer Fall: 29-32.

Troutman RM, Braunstin G. Victimization in a Predominately Black Psychiatric Population. A Preliminary Study, in press.

Chairman MILLER. We will have a number of questions. Thank you very much, Dr. Bell.

Dr. Spivak.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD SPIVAK, M.D., DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH, BOSTON, MA

Dr. SPIVAK. Thank you, Chairman Miller, and members of the committee. It is a real pleasure to have been invited here today, but it is even more of a pleasure to see you dealing with this issue, dealing with it from different perspectives because the approach to this issue has been rooted in an after-the-fact response that is clearly not working.

I would like to start with a story of a young girl that I work with in Boston. The young girl's name is Kima. She is 17 years old and she is a junior in high school. In the last year-and-a-half, she has been to 16 funerals for friends of hers. The oldest was 21, the youngest was 14. The most recent one was a 19 year old former boyfriend of her sister, who was shot in a barber-shop in a fight over who was next in line for a haircut.

Now, let us put this into some perspective. The United States has the fifth highest homicide rate in the world. Countries like Brazil, Guatemala and Thailand represent the few countries with higher rates than ours. As I am sure you are all aware, those are countries facing considerable social, political and economic turmoil, so there is something going on in this country that is very serious. The homicide rates in the U.S. range from 10 to 30 times higher than most western countries in Europe, Asia, and other industrialized areas of the world.

I have been asked to comment on trends, but the reality is that this issue has been serious for a long time. So it is not getting worse. It has been bad for a very, very long time. We are seeing at this point several generations of young people, and especially young black men, that are being devastated by this issue.

I think what is happening more recently, and why there may be some increased attention and awareness to this, is that just as drugs overflowed out of inner cities 20 years ago, and suddenly people discovered that drugs were a problem, violence is beginning to overflow out of our inner cities and into our suburbs. It is not uncommon at this point to read, at least in Boston newspapers, of teenagers beating each other up over relatively minor issues and putting their friends in the hospital, or worse. So this is no longer an issue that is confined to our inner cities. However, it is still a major and predominant issue in our inner cities.

The typical homicide, in spite of what gets represented in the media, occurs between two young men who know each other, who are of the same race, who have been drinking, who get into an argument, one of whom is carrying a knife or a gun that gets pulled as the argument escalates and somebody gets hurt or killed. If we put this in the context that we have delegated this issue to the criminal justice system, which provides punitive, after-the-fact interventions, in an effort to discourage violence, there is no way that the threat of punishment is going to prevent two young men

who know each other, who have been drinking, who get in an argument, from hurting or killing each other. Because this is rooted in very basic and serious conditions that these young people are growing up in, and has little to do with whether the police are going to come or whether anyone is going to end up in jail. That is not the consideration in these cases.

This is an issue deeply rooted in poverty. The black homicide rates in this country are from 6 to 12 times higher than the white rates. When you correct those rates for socio-economic factors, the racial differences disappear. So this is rooted in the fact that blacks and other minority groups are overrepresented in poverty and deal with the implications of that poverty. Part of that involves a lower threshold for the use of violence.

This is also rooted in the gender models that we establish for our young people. Look at the heroes we put in front of our young people, especially young men. There is barely a hero in television or movies who does not choose violence as the primary mechanism for solving their problems. They pull out their semiautomatics and their handguns and they fix their problems. And what is worse is they get what they want and there are no consequences for it.

I had a 19 year old boy tell me in an emergency room once, after being shot, that he was surprised that it hurt. It was because no one ever got hurt in the media. Inner city young people in particular, are surrounded by violence in their daily lives.

When we go into Boston classrooms to teach our violence prevention curriculum, the first question we ask is how many people know somebody who has been murdered, and literally every hand goes up in the classroom. When we ask how many of the students have lost family members from violence, a half to two-thirds of the hands go up. So these kids deal with this issue every day of their lives.

Now, there are some predictive factors. We know the kinds of circumstances that put people at greater risk for violence. We know that poverty is a risk factor. We know that gender is a risk factor. We know that age is a risk factor. We also know that children who grow up in violent families are at risk for being violent when they grow up. We have this incredible social service system around the country that takes kids out of violent homes to protect them, but does nothing to help them deal with the long-term consequences of the violence they have experienced. These kids grow up to be violent and they hurt each other. They hurt their own children.

We also know that drugs and alcohol are related to violence. Fifty percent of homicide victims have elevated blood alcohol levels, and in those cases where assailants are caught, where the blood alcohol level is relevant to the event itself, 50 percent in that case have elevated blood alcohol levels. We know that alcohol and certain drugs reduce the threshold for exhibiting violence in the context of conflict or anger.

Maybe last and most important is that we are learning more and more that violence is learned, that children learn it from seeing it in their families and they learn it from television and the movies. When you put a young child in front of a TV screen and you exhibit violence to them, they act that violence out in their play and they begin to use that violence to deal with their own conflicts.

99-355 0 - 89 - 2

What is equally important to know is that when you put children in front of a TV screen and they are presented with nonviolent problem-solving strategies, they mimic those behaviors. So that prosocial behavior is also learned. The problem is that we are emphasizing the violent solutions and we are deemphasizing the prosocial solutions.

The last thing I want to touch on in terms of factors that contribute to this is the issue of weapons. There are 20 million unregistered handguns in this country. In Boston, you can rent them on street corners or buy them for minimal amounts of money. In a survey done in Boston a few years ago, over 25 percent of kids reported bringing guns or knives to school at least on one occasion. And lest you think girls are protected from this behavior, almost 20 percent of girls, almost 30 percent of boys reported such behavior. I think we are going to start seeing dramatic increases in homicide rates and violent behavior among girls as we continue to portray an increasing number of women heroes who also choose violence to solve problems.

Now, as distressing as this situation is, the more we learn about this, the more we learn what to do about it. Although we need to continue to support the criminal justice system in its response to this problem, we need to begin to support and develop preventive interventions. I think Dr. Bell outlined a number of those very well. We can teach kids to behave differently.

But in that context, I must point out that when we go around seeking funds to do this, there is no primary place for us to go. The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) funds primarily criminal justice activities, and the Department of Health and Human Services, through the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Maternal and Child Services, funds some of this, but not nearly the magnitude of money that is needed for this effort. To do this right is going to cost money. But the savings for doing it will be 10, 20, 30 times higher than that. The longer we wait to put some support behind this, the more it is going to cost us.

I think I will close on that note. I will also take questions when we are done. I thank you for this opportunity.

[Prepared statement of Howard Spivak, M.D., follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HOWARD SPIVAK, M.D., DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH, BOSTON, MA

MAY 16, 1989

Violence and its consequences of injury and death represent a major health problem in this country. The United States has the fifth highest homicide rate in the world, 10 times higher than that of England and 25 times higher than that of Spain. In fact, the U.S. homicide rate rivals countries that are experiencing considerable social, economic, and political turmoil. In 1980, homicide and assault were responsible for over 23,000 deaths, 700,000 potential years of life lost, 350,000 hospitalizations, 1.5 million hospital days, and $640 million in health care costs. And, the problem is growing.

Fatalities from violence represent only the tip of the iceberg; nonfatal intentional injuries occur as much as 100 times more frequently. Assault and intentional injuries identified in medical settings can be four times that reported to the police, suggesting that medical institutions are a primary site for identification of individuals with violence-related problems. This fact alone requires that a health and public health perspective be incorporated into the effort to respond to this serious problem.

In addition, violence is a major cause of death among adolescents and young adults. Homicide has risen over the past several decades to become the second leading cause of death for all 15 to 24 year olds in the United States. Young black men are at the greatest risk for death and injury from violence. Their rate of death from homicide is from six (for 15-24 year olds) to twelve (for 25-44 year olds) times higher than the national rate.

The issue of violence has traditionally been delegated to the police and criminal justice system. The characteristics of a large majority of violent events and homicides do not, however, suggest that the after-the-fact response of the criminal justice system and the threat of punishment for violent behavior will have a major effect in deterring violence. Although the media typically presents violence as coldly premeditated,randomly directed to innocent bystanders, or related to criminal activity such as robbery or drug dealing, the more common scenario is dramatically different. A majority of homicides occur between two young men of the same race who know each other; who have been drinking; who get into an argument (often over a relatively minor issue); and, one of whom is carrying a weapon. The spontaneous, unplanned, and intimate nature of these events make it unlikely that the criminal justice consequences are taken into consideration before the violent behavior leads to injury or death.

Statistics demonstrate that social and cultural factors such as poverty, racism, availability of weapons, media influences, gender expectations, etc. place certain persons at greater risk of violence. Furthermore, individual factors, such as family history of violence or low self-esteem, substance abuse, weapon carrying, etc. also increase the risk of violence. Knowledge of these factors can help in the identification and intervention of individuals at special risk for intentional injury.

A common misconception about violence is that it is interracial. In reality, 80 per cent of homicides occur between members of the same race. Although racism adds to the anger and stress that can contribute to violence, little violence actually is racially instigated. Rather, it is increasingly clear that socioeconomic status is a greater predictor of violence and that the over-representation of blacks in the violence and homicide statistics reflects their over-representation in poverty. Studies that have corrected homicide rates for socioeconomic status have found that racial differences in these rates disappear when poverty is taken into account.

Most homicide victims (77 per cent) are male. Women are also subject to and involved in intentional violence, but are much less likely to be seriously injured. Differences in weapon-carrying behavior and social expectations may contribute to their lower rates of more serious injuries and homicide. However, with increases in the number of media-portrayed female heroes who are as violent as their male counterparts, we can expect that the gap between male and female homicide and intentional injury rates may be reduced.

Adolescents are at high risk for violence because of the rapid psychological and physical changes that occur in the transition to adulthood. Teenagers face a number of major developmental tasks, including (1) individuation from family through a narcissistic period of self-development; (2) development of a sexual identity that includes a period of identification with sexual extremes, such as the macho image for males and extreme femininity for females; (3) development of a moral and personal value system through experimentation; and (4) preparation for future employment and responsibility.

Many of the behaviors associated with these developmental tasks predispose adolescents to violence. The narcissism of adolescence has a strong component of self-consciousness and makes teenagers extremely vulnerable to embarrassment, even from the most minor insult. Peer pressure, which is important to facilitating success in many developmental tasks, also can enhance the likelihood of violent behavior. If fighting is expected by peers, then an adolescent will have considerable difficulty disregarding the pressures to fight. In addition, anger associated with the limited economic options of poverty and racism exacerbates this situation and lowers a young person's threshold for violence.

It is the personal, behavioral, and spontaneous characteristics of violence that both raise the most concern and offer direction for intervention. Almost 60 per cent of victims and assailants know each other, and 20 per cent of victims and assailants are members of the same family. One half or more of homicides are precipitated by an argument as compared to only 15 per cent of homicides occurring in the course of committing another crime. Alcohol use also contributes to violent behavior; approximately half of all homicide victims have elevated blood alcohol levels.

The availability and carrying of weapons is also a major factor in this situation. It is estimated that there are over 20 million unregistered hand guns in the U.S., in addition to the millions and millions of legally licensed firearms. Young people are getting access to these weapons and are carrying them in increasing numbers, often in the context of "self protection". One survey in Boston, Massachusetts reported that over one quarter of high school students (37% of boys, 17% of girls) carried guns or knives, at least on occasion.

Most importantly, the evidence is mounting that violence is a learned response to stress and conflict. Exposure to violence in the home has been strongly associated with violent behavior in children and youth. There is growing also evidence that young people learn from and demonstrate the violent behavior that they observe on television. This is particularly relevant given the extent of violence displayed in the media and the predominance of heroes on television and in motion pictures who choose violent means as their primary mechanism to solve problems. Violence is generally presented in the media as the first choice option for dealing with conflict. Furthermore, it is portrayed as always successful and without negative consequences.

One young man being treated in an emergency room for a gunshot wound told me that he was surprised that the injury hurt; his perception from television was that such injuries were neither painful nor incapacitating. It is particularly important in this context to point out that when children observe nonviolent problem-solving strategies on television, they are found to mimic these behaviors when conflicts arise. So, the prosocial behaviors and responses to conflict also can be learned. Unfortunately, such positive exposures are the exceptions and too infrequent to counter the negative images. This can be changed.

Addressing the problem of interpersonal violence involves the collaboration of a broad base of professionals and community organizations. Given the relatively recent focus on the problem, there are only a few programs to look to for assistance in developing interventions. Most efforts to date have focused on the role of the criminal justice system, which has for the most part provided after-the-fact, punitive responses to violent events.

The fact that most intentional injuries are produced by known assailants, are not premeditated, and are associated with identifiable psycho-social and behavioral risk factors begs for other avenues of response to the problem that must be developed.

Efforts to handle these characteristics can and should be implemented in the following ways: (1) primary prevention of violence as a response to anger and conflict; (2) screening for and early identification of high-risk individuals; (3) increased availability of secondary level services for the high-risk population; and (4) improved rehabilitative services. Within this context, the medical and public health communities can play an important role in collaboration with other appropriate human service, mental health, education, community, and criminal justice institutions.

Violence needs to be incorporated into the health care system agenda. While individual clinicians cannot address violence in isolation, the public health sector can play a role in establishing a broader context for violence prevention. An increased level of awareness and understanding needs to be established at the community level.

One such effort is currently in progress in the city of Boston. This program is a large-scale initiative concerning violence prevention that includes community-based education through schools, existing community agencies, and mass media. The program is targeting two specific urban neighborhoods with high adolescent homicide rates in an effort to assess the impact of a violence prevention project.

Another public health approach used in addressing health problems involves attempts to manipulate the environment to reduce risk. For example, safety locks on firearms (analogous to safety caps on medication bottles) may reduce unintentional firearm injuries, as well as provide a moment for second thought in unplanned violent events. In this context, mechanisms to reduce access to weapons must be seriously considered.

The public health system also can contribute to the establishment of improved secondary prevention and intervention services through: advocacy of more extensive mental health services for those with problems of violent behavior; and collaboration between the health care and criminal justice systems to improve access to supportive services for individuals at high risk for violent behavior.

These strategies have a sound basis for what is already known about violence. Further development and evaluation of primary prevention initiatives will contribute greatly to our understanding of the problem and its potential solution. As this is an issue that particularly affects the minority community, input and involvement of that community is of great importance to assure that inappropriate stereotypes are avoided and cultural perspectives are maintained in addressing the problem.

The magnitude and characteristics of the problem of violence cry out for new, creative approaches and the need for insights from different perspectives. The public health community can make a real contribution to its resolution through prevention, treatment, and research. The extent of the violence we experience in this country is deeply rooted in our values as expressed by media images, availability and acceptability of weapons, use of violence to solve problems, and through messages we express to our children and youth. We must act now to address these values and turn the tide before we become overwhelmed by the consequences of these values.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Human Services
Department of Public Health
150 Tremont Street
Boston 02111
617-727-2700

Michael S. Dukakis
Governor

Philip W. Johnston
Secretary

Deborah Prothrow-Stith, M.D.
Commissioner

March 28, 1989

James Mason, M.D., Ph.D.
Assistant Secretary for Health
Department of Health and Human Services
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Dear Dr. Mason,

We would like to thank you for meeting with us on March 10 in Washington. Dr. Sullivan's swearing-in was certainly an inspiration and we look forward to his and your tenure.

Enclosed is the concept paper for a multi-city trial to reduce assault and homicide. This model of a multi-city trial is one that has been used for over a decade by NIH. This project provides an opportunity to test the suitability of a multi-city trial for a non-biomedical public health problem.

The immediacy of this problem is reflected in the fact that several overwhelmed local and national officials have recently proposed use of the National Guard or militia in many urban centers to deal with gang violence. We feel strongly that there is a major role for public health prevention approaches in addressing violence. We propose this trial as a way for you, Secretary Sullivan and President Bush to respond to this severe problem and promote a kinder, gentler nation.

We look forward to discussing this concept with you further at your earliest possible convenience.

Sincerely,

Deborah Prothrow-Stith, M.D.
Commissioner of Public Health
Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Reed V. Tuckson, M.D. (MS)
Reed V. Tuckson, M.D.
Commissioner of Public Health
District of Columbia

Woodrow Myers (AS)
Woodrow A. Myers, M.D., M.B.A.
State Health Commissioner
Indiana State Board of Health

Enclosure

ASSAULT AND HOMICIDE REDUCTION TRIAL

The United States has one of the highest homicide rates in the industrialized world.[1] In 1980, homicide and aggravated assault accounted for more than 23,970 deaths, 696,631 potential years of life lost, 350,000 hospitalizations, 1.5 million hospital days, and a minimum of $638 million in health care costs.[2] Young black males living in the inner city, over-represented among the poor and unemployed, are at greatest risk of being either the victim or the perpetrator of a violent act.[3] Major urban centers have recently experienced an exacerbation of violence. The District of Columbia, for example, has reported 137 homicides in the first 82 calendar days of 1989.[4] In fact, death from homicide is the single greatest cause of death for young black men, nationally.[3]

The common image of homicide, as portrayed by the news media, implies premeditation, crime involvement, and/or racial instigation. Surprisingly, only 15% of all homicides occur during the course of a crime.[5] Most homicides occur between people who know each other (usually of the same race), as the result of an argument where alcohol is involved. These "intimate" and spontaneous characteristics do not fit the usual media representation of violence.

Traditionally, the control of violence has been delegated to the criminal justice and legislative fields. Strategies have been limited to the threat of punishment and law enforcement as a perceived deterrent, and rehabilitation as a secondary intervention measure. These efforts are not preventive, and do not necessarily result in lasting effects. The characteristics of violence render it unlikely to be affected by punitive, after-the-fact interventions.

These same characteristics, however, permit the conceptualization of violence as a public health problem, as done by the Surgeon General and the Public Health Service in 1980, and support the use of prevention strategies successful for other behavior-related health problems.[6] The severity and urgency of this growing national problem cry out for new preventive and treatment programs.

A three city, five year public health violence reduction trial targeting youth is proposed with an extensive evaluation that will include three matched control cities. Presently, several projects across the nation are addressing violence prevention and reduction through creative use of traditional public health strategies. The earliest work used high school health education on anger and violence.[7] This effort grew and evolved into a community-based approach which included the use of community agencies, churches, neighborhood health centers and the media, in addition to the schools.[8] Other programs have involved emergency room interventions, community-based strategies and establishment of stronger links to criminal justice systems.[5,10,11] While those designing and participating in such

efforts support their continuance, and while the strategies are traditional public health strategies found effective in other instances, evaluation data is not conclusive. The difficulty of data collection and the low frequency of the most severe measurable episodes (homicides) have limited the ability to assess the effects of such strategies on adolescents.

This multi-city trial is designed to bring together current strategies into a comprehensive violence reduction progam in three cities (Springfield, MA, the District of Columbia, Indianapolis, IN). This model of a multi-city trial is one that has been used for over a decade by the NIH. This project provides an opportunity to test the suitability of a multi-city trial for a non-biomedical public health problem. The three programs will implement school, emergency room, community and media based interventions over five years and regularly measure the effect on numbers of assaults reported to schools, police, and emergency rooms and the number of homicides. Surveys will also be conducted to assess knowledge, attitudes and self-reported behavior (fighting and weapon carrying). This data will be compared with the matched control city data.

THE COMPREHENSIVE VIOLENCE REDUCTION PROGRAMS

I. Schools

In each city, the school system will implement violence prevention and anger management curricula. Suggested grade levels are 3rd, 5th, 7th and 9th. Currently available curricula that seem to be effective and appropriate for each grade level will be used. Teachers will be trained in a standard way to use the materials. The school systems will commit to a five year program of implementation of the education materials and data collection.

II. Emergency Rooms

The emergency rooms serving the communities with the higher numbers of episodes of violence will participate. Waiting room materials and video programs will be displayed. Those persons treated in the emergency room because of an episode of violence will be given the materials, shown the video tape and encouraged to have an initial conversation with an ER counselor, or referred to a secondary care network.

III. Community Agencies

Existing staff who work with adolescents in the churches, boys and girls clubs, health centers, and other appropriate community agencies will be trained to used the curriculum materials and will receive the technical assistance necessary to utilize the strategies within their agencies. This will not involve the addition of new staff for the agency, but will be directed to the training of existing staff and integration of the violence prevention work into currently existing programs.

IV. Media

Public Service Announcements which educate and provide information on violence prevention and which provide program information will air in each city. These PSA's will be for radio and television and billboards.

V. Secondary Care Network

During the implementation of primary prevention efforts it is inevitable that children will be identified who need specialized intervention. For some that would include traditional mental health behavioral modification strategies. Such strategies are an appropriate part of the health care system. In addition, access to social services, mental health, and follow up medical care may be indicated and must often interface with the criminal justice system. This network of back up treatment services will be developed in each community.

EVALUATION

The evaluation will be designed to measure the impact of the program on different outcomes and at different levels, from the individual to the community. A quasi-experimental design, employing test and control cities and subgroups will be used. The three measurement objectives are 1) the extent to which program services were implemented in a timely and sufficient manner, 2) changes in knowledge and attitudes around the problem of adolescent violence as a result of the intervention, and 3) impact of the intervention on specific violent behavior in the target population.

A variety of methodologies will be used to achieve these objectives. Both quantitative and qualitative methods will comprise the process evaluation (Objective 1). Detailed records of project activities will be kept and client/participant characteristics will be documented.

Survey methodology will be employed for Objective 2: the measurement of knowledge and attitude changes. Random-digit dialed surveys will be conducted each year to measure both exposure to the project and its impact on knowledge, attitudes, and self-reported behavior. Self-administered questionnaires with similar content will be given to groups of adolescent project participants in a pre-test/post-test fashion (with controls) to measure project impact in a smaller setting.

A variety of sources will be used for information on the project's impact on violent behavior (Objective 3). School suspension data, juvenile arrest data, and emergency room assault data will be used in a time series fashion to note any changes since project implementation.

All data collection for objectives 2 and 3 will be compared to similarly collected data from the control communities.

TIMELINE

From the start of the program through the first year of implementation, the training of school teachers, agency counselors and others using the curriculum and materials will take place. The work with the local media to plan a kick off and regular airing of the program campaign will take place in this first year as well.

Years two, three and four will include program implementation and data collection. After three full years of program, the fifth year will involve completion of the data collection and analysis.

BUDGET

Annual - Year 1

National Project Director	-	$50,000 + 25% benefits	= $ 62,500
3 Local Project Directors	-	($35,000 + 25% benefits) x 3	= $131,250
6 Trainers/City x 3 cities	-	($25,000 + 25% benefits) x 18	= $562,500
4 Secretaries	-	($18,000 + 25% benefits) x 4	= $ 90,000
4 Administrative Assts.	-	($22,000 + 25% benefits) x 4	= $110,000
National Research Director	-	$50,000 + 25% benefits	= $ 62,500
6 Local Research Assts.	-	($25,000 + 25% benefits) x 6	= $187,500
Media Consultant	-	$25,000	= $ 25,000
Media Development	-	$100,000	= $100,000
Materials	-	$200,000	= $200,000
Travel	-	$ 10,000	= $ 10,000
Annual Meeting	-	$ 15,000	= $ 15,000
6 Surveys	-	($50,000) x 6	= $300,000
Data Analysis	-	($25,000) x 6	= $150,000
TOTAL (Year 1)			= $2,006,250

Years 2-5: to be developed

FOOTNOTES

1. Wolfgang, M. Homicide in other industrialized countries. Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, 1986, 62, p. 400.

2. Federal Bureau of Investigation. Uniform Crime Report: Crime in the United States, 1981. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Justice, 1980.

3. Centers for Disease Control: Homicide Surveillance: High Risk Racial and Ethnic Groups - Black and Hispanics, Atlanta, GA, 1970 - 1981. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control, 1986.

4. Vital Statistics Department: District of Columbia Department of Health.

5. Centers for Disease Control: Homicide-United States. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Reports, 1982, 31, pp. 599-602.

6. United States Public Health Service. Promoting Health/Preventing Disease: Objectives for the Nation. Washington, D.C.: United States Public Health Service, 1980.

7. Deborah Prothrow-Stith, "Interdisciplinary Interventions Applicable to Prevention of Interpersonal Violence and Homicide in Black Youth," in Surgeon General's Workshop on Violence & Public Health, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Publication No. HRS-D-MC 86-1 (1986), pp. 35-43.

8. Prothrow-Stith, D.B., Spivak, H.R., Hausman, A.J.: The Violence Prevention Project: A public health approach. Science, Technology and Human Values, 1987, (Summer/Fall) pp. 67-69.

9. Klingbeil, K.: Comprehensive model to detect, assess, and treat assaultive violence in hospital settings. Unpublished manuscript, Task Force on Black and Minority Health, DHHS, Jan., 1985.

10. Cohen, Larry: "Costa Contra County Violence Prevention Initiative". APHA Presentation, 1988.

11. Falakah, F.: Call and catalytic response: The House of Umoja. In R. Mathias, P. DeMuro & R. Allinson (Eds.), Violent Juvenile Offenders - An Anthology. San Francisco CA: San Francisco National Council on Crime & Delinquency, 1984, pp. 231-236.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you.
Judge Walton.

STATEMENT OF HON. REGGIE B. WALTON, ASSOCIATE JUDGE, SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA; AND NOMINEE FOR ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY, WASHINGTON, DC

Judge WALTON. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. It is an honor to have the opportunity to appear before you today because I do have very profound concerns about what I see happening in the streets of our cities, and also our rural areas, in reference to children. I have, over the last eight years, seen it in the courtroom, which is merely a reflection of what is taking place in the community.

Having been a defense lawyer for two years in Philadelphia, a prosecutor for approximately 6 years here in Washington, and on the bench for approximately eight years, I have seen a steady increase in the number of young people who are coming before the court and the severity of the offenses that those young people are being charged with.

Already this year, we have approximately 170 homicides committed here in the city, and approximately 56 committed in Prince George's County, MD, and a significant number of those individuals who were killed were young people. I have seen in the court the age of the individuals committing these offenses go down. It was rare that I saw a situation several years ago where there was a teenager who was charged with a homicide. It obviously happened on occasions, but it wasn't something that is as routine as to what we see happening today.

I think that illustrative of the problem is what we saw recently in Central Park, the senseless assault perpetrated by a number of young people, and the number of young people who we see committing the homicides and violent assaults that are taking place here in the District of Columbia.

I am also very concerned about what I see in reference to the number of young people who are involving themselves in drug activity. I spoke not too long ago at a junior high school in northeast Washington and was told by the principal that one of her major concerns and difficulties that she deals with on a daily basis is the fact that the older individuals involved in drug activity are recruiting her students to sell drugs. Because of the significant profits that can be made in the drug trade, and coupled, unfortunately, with the fact that many of the young people who I come in contact with and talk to will tell you that because the consequences of being apprehended are not that significant, it is worth taking the risk to involve themselves in that type of activity.

I think there are a lot of obvious reasons as to why the situation exists. Unfortunately, there has been a deterioration of the moral fabric of our society. I think to a large degree the deterioration of the family structure has played a significant part in that. We have seen a steady increase in the number of young people who are being raised only by their mother. Obviously, there are many mothers who can successfully raise children by themselves. On

Sunday, I believe, there was an article in the Washington Post about a woman who had overcome her drug addiction and had raised children very successfully, including some young male children.

Unfortunately, I think that statistically it would suggest that it's a lot harder, though, for a woman to raise children by herself, and especially if you're talking about adolescent males. I know from my upbringing the importance that my father played in my life. Unfortunately, a lot of the young people that we see coming into the court system have never had a father who played any role in their life. Fifty-two percent of black children being raised today are being raised only by their mothers.

I think if you would look at the statistics of the number of young men who are coming into the court system here in the District of Columbia, you would probably find that upward of 90 percent of those young men have never had a father play any role in their life. The father, I believe, plays a significant role in a young man because it does place certain restrictions on him and it does give him some appreciation, if he has a strong, positive father figure, of what the appropriate role of a male is in this society.

I think also a factor that is playing a significant role in what we see taking place in society is the number of teenage pregnancies. One out of four babies ~~who are~~ born in America today to black women are being born to teenagers. The women are teenagers when they bring those children into the world. Obviously, we have to do something about that.

I feel that the situation is not hopeless, however. We are in a crisis. We do have a situation that we have to try and come to grips with if we're going to seek to save a lot of our young people who are salvageable. But there are a lot of things that we need to do.

I think that as far as the court system is concerned, we have to have a policy that when a young person comes before the court, we seek to work with the entire family, however the family may exist. I think we have to involve the mother, if it's only the mother who is involved in the home, and we have to involve that mother in the process so that we can try and work with her and hopefully improve that mother's parenting skills and the ability to cope with the pressures that she has to deal with on a daily basis in trying to raise children by herself.

I think we also have to do whatever we can to get more of our black men involved in working with young black children. As I indicated, a lot of our young black men, unfortunately, don't have strong father and male role models to look up to. I think it is important that we do all that we can to encourage men to involve themselves in the Big Brother program. I think it's important that we encourage men to involve themselves in the mentor programs so that they come in contact with young men, so that young men have an appreciation that there are success stories other than those who are selling drugs on the street corner.

I think it is also important that, in reference to the inner city, that we do something regarding improving the quality of the athletic programs that exist. I rarely find a young man who comes before the court who is actively involved in athletics. It is just a

rarity. It does happen occasionally, but not very often. I am dismayed by the fact that I served on a panel that looked at the athletic programs here in the District of Columbia and concluded that they were in dismal condition and that something had to be done immediately in order to cause those athletic programs to survive. We made approximately 10 to 12 recommendations to the Superintendent of Schools and to the School Board regarding things that could be done to make involvement in athletics more attractive.

Unfortunately, not one of those recommendations has been adopted, because to a large degree they involve money and the School Board indicates that they don't have the money to put into those programs.

I was dismayed to find out that there is, according to what I was told during the course of the hearings that we had, and the investigations we did regarding that task force, that there is an underground basketball league apparently that exists, which is financed by the drug dealers. They apparently are recruiting young men to participate on these teams and paying them sums of money to play, and then the various drug dealers bet on these teams and compete against each other. That was appalling to find that happening. I think to a large degree that may be attributable to the fact that many of our young men are not attracted to participate in the athletic programs in their schools because the athletic fields are in poor condition, the equipment they have is in poor condition, and therefore there is not a significant incentive for them to participate in those programs.

I do think, however, that we have to appreciate the fact that most young people, even those young people who are growing up in the poorest areas of our cities, are good kids. Most do not involve themselves in criminal activity. It is only a minority that is involving themselves in such activity. We must do something to deter that, because I do believe that, as has been indicated, learned behavior can deter criminal activity. I think if we spend the resources on making sure that many of our young people don't come into the court system and don't involve themselves in criminal activity, ultimately the amount of money that we end up spending in the criminal justice system will be decreased.

I have enjoyed the opportunity to be here today and I will welcome any questions that you may have.

[Prepared statement of Hon. Reggie B. Walton follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. REGGIE B. WALTON, ASSOCIATE JUDGE, SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA; AND NOMINEE FOR ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY, WASHINGTON, DC

In the recent past there has been a steady escalation of the volumn and severity of criminal offenses committed by juveniles. The recent assault in Central Park in New York City and the growing number of teenagers being charged with committing serious assaults and murders in the District of Columbia illustrate the growing problem.

In addition to increased participation in crimes of violence, many teenagers, and even pre-teenagers, are involved in the illicit sale of drugs. This is especially true in the inner city. Fueled by the large profits made by drug dealers, juveniles are increasingly involving themselves in such activity. Nevertheless, the vast majority of young people do not participate in illegal activity and this point cannot emphasized enough.

For those juveniles committing criminal acts, the community has a right to have in place a system of laws which adequately protects it against such individuals. It matters not from the prospective of a victim or a neighborhood being ravished by the drug epidemic that the per-

petrator is a juvenile. The pain and suffering are the same irregardless of whether the person who commits the crime is 14 or 25.

However, there are remarkably different ways that we treat individuals prosecuted in the adult system as compared to prosecutions in the juvenile justice system. In some circumstances this distinction is justified because of the belief that the conduct was caused by youthful indiscretions. However, there are certain crimes which are so heinous or so detrimental to the community that the difference in treatment must be questioned.

For example, if the 14 year old young men in the Central Park case had committed their assault in Rock Creek Park, they could not be prosecuted in this jurisdiction as adults. Thus, if convicted in the District of Columbia of what can be characterized as nothing other than an act of savagery, the 14 year old young men could only be detained for two years and would have to be released back into the community at that time if their institutional conduct had been good.

Many of the young people involved in the illegal drug trade do so because the risk of prosecution does not act as a deterrent. Knowing that a conviction in juvenile court will in all probability result in little or no punishment,

the benefits derived from involvement in the drug world outweigh the risks. In fact, many juveniles are being recruited by older individuals to sell drugs where the risk of apprehension is the greatest, knowing the consequences following arrest are not substantial. We must not permit this situation to continue unabated.

While some will suggest that prosecuting 14 year old criminals as adults is unduly harsh, in my opinion, some offenses call out for such treatment. At a time when the moral fabric of many of our communities is being shredded, those who are destroying the quality of life for the good, honest and law abiding citizens who live in such communities must be made to pay for their conduct. Failure to do so will only further contribute to the decline of our society.

In many respects, the juvenile justice system has served us well. In other respects it has not. The entire system must therefore be scrutinized and the ills of the system corrected. We must rethink whether the artificial ages which control when a person can be prosecuted as an adult should be retained. While some might like to think that we can save everyone, such thoughts are naive. Certain people, for whatever reasons, are evil or prone to engage in criminal activity and nothing we do will change

that reality. Such individuals must be separated from the rest of us for the good of society. Crimes like the Central Park attack cannot be totally alleviated, but those who commit such acts must be punished harshly, regardless of the age of the perpetrator or where the act is committed. A slap on the wrist will just not do.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you.
Miss Meier.

STATEMENT OF DEBORAH MEIER, PRINCIPAL, OF THE CENTRAL PARK EAST SECONDARY SCHOOL, IN EAST HARLEM, NEW YORK, NY

Ms. MEIER. I have enjoyed listening to the three previous speakers, and it is a pleasure to be here this morning.

I'm sorry that Charlie Hayes left because I actually started my teaching career in Chicago. Furthermore I am now spending my teaching career, on the very streets about which "Down these mean streets" was written some 30 years ago.

I am the Principal of Central Park East Secondary School, which is located in East Harlem. I must remind you that I am not here as a representative of the Board of Education, although many of the things I say I think are shared by many teachers and principals in New York.

Our school is located on the edge of Central Park, and for the last several weeks we have, of course, been gripped by a special sadness, because one of our students in the building that we share with two other schools has been charged with being part of the attack on the young woman runner several weeks ago.

Most of the young people I see daily are low-income youngsters, living in the inner city of Manhattan. They are largely African-American and Latino. But their attitudes are not uniquely characteristic of any particular culture or environment. My daughter lives and teaches 100 miles north, in a small village in New York State, and she reports the same attitudes and problems of violence, vandalism, rape, arson, drunken driving and family violence. It is also important to know that the 20 percent white students who attend my school demonstrate a remarkably similar set of values, fears and experiences.

Violence is normal in the world of today's adolescent. Even worse, it is glamorous and appealing. When our students let their guard down, they reveal that their ideal of manliness exudes violence. Rape is often seen as just a form of sex. For a woman, the ideal is to be at once tough and docile, tramp and innocent, and to be a man is to sneer at the weak and never to back down under threat. To be a woman is to take care of your man's needs. These are ideals they didn't invent, nor did their families or their communities. But they affect most deeply those most vulnerable, who take them most literally.

This attitude is, of course, reinforced by everything they see on TV, the movies, advertising, politics and business. From "Rambo" to corporate raiders, it is the aggressive, tough-minded guy who never flinches at blood or gore, who gets the job done regardless of law and societal constraints. They are the admirable, effective people, and they are very different than the teachers and parents who struggle and work in mundane circumstances, who have very little status or glamour or money. By comparison with the success models touted on television, parents and teachers seem rather small-minded, petty people, diminishing their possibility of serving as effective role models.

Schools are one critical place to intervene. But they are not the only place or even the most important. Remember, children don't come to our schools until they are five or six years of age; school occupies only half, 185 days, out of 365; and only five or six hours a day is actually spent in classes. So changing schools is not enough.

Furthermore, violence is not learned in schools, and only rarely experienced, in fact, in school, with all the talk about school violence. In contrast, it's a daily part of young peoples experience in their neighborhoods and, unfortunately, even their homes. Metal detectors don't safeguard their communities.

But schools can make a difference. We at Central Park East Secondary School believe that what we are doing addresses such issues. Our approach to classroom education, to community service, teaching kids better forms of conflict resolution, and in our work with families, these are ways of countering the isolation and the anonymity of most of our Nation's high school students, ways which increase the attraction and possibility of their seeing life as something worth living.

When schools were first designed, few youngsters were expected to complete them. It is only since World War II that the average American has been expected to graduate from high school, and only very recently that all citizens and our entire work force were expected to meet high intellectual standards, not just a paper diploma. The schools we designed for an earlier day still exist, yet we want them to do a very different job.

Our kids are treated in our schools like objects on an obsolete assembly line, going from one disconnected subject to another every 35 to 45 minutes. Math follows English, home economics follows literature, minds on/minds off. Then we wonder why our children have short attention spans, rarely take things seriously, and find school more boring than the street.

America's schools are like a badly organized conference that goes on for 185 days, day after day, lots of plenary sessions, few breaks, no time for talking with one's colleagues, poor food, a few bad-tempered presenters who yell at the audience or belittle a conference attendee who falls asleep at the back of the room or tries to sneak out for a cigarette.

Why do we attend such conferences, you and I? To see old friends, to network, to meet new acquaintances, and to make connections. That, of course, is what kids are doing in our schools.

Kids are quick to read the real value we place on education. They see that teachers do not enjoy the most minimal amenities in their work life. From towels in the washroom to telephones or xerox machines, tools all of us have come to take for granted in modern offices but are absent in our schools. While we have laws that assure parents time off to vote or to leave to serve on juries, we have no such laws requiring employers to grant time off so that parents can attend school conferences without losing pay or even losing their job. But we berate them when they don't show up.

For most of my parents, involvement with their children's education is very tough and very problematic. Families spend a great deal of time, as do teachers, trying to pass on good values, but everything in the child's culture and environment contradicts our messages. If we want families and communities and teachers to

become tougher guardians of their youngsters, we need to change the power relationship between such parents and such adults and the kids. Parents and the community can exert power when they are seen as effective protectors; but when their resources, time, and energy prohibit them from providing more than the poorest shelter, most meager food and clothing, and no protection, then they are seen as weak adult authority figures. They dare not say no because they fear their children will go elsewhere to more dangerous and more lucrative places.

The American dream is not a part of the family mythology of many of our poor. Instead, the dream of quick success and violence, a la TV and the streets, is the myth which has more power. That is not a question of social pathology. It's a situation that could be changed by public policy decisions.

I would like to make some recommendations: one, that our children's parents need decent housing, decent paying jobs, and accessible health care if they are to reclaim parental authority. Further, the punitive reluctant quality of our public welfare programs has to be changed, so that parents are not demeaned before their embarrassed children.

Two, there must be a renewed, visible national commitment to end the racism and sexism that still dominates the public and private worlds that our children live in. Things are better than they were 30 years ago, and I often remind my students of this. But that doesn't mean much to them. They are children now, their pain is now, and they are sick of hearing about what it used to be like, that it was once even worse.

Three, we must spend money on children apart from their schooling. Our school buildings should be places for year-round, week-long supervised activities, where children can build their minds and friendships, rather than schools being empty while students spend hours in front of TV sets watching shows that feed their feelings of emptiness, powerlessness and loneliness. This takes money.

Four, we need to make our own schools smaller and our facilities more appealing. Just because we built big buildings for economy reasons, doesn't mean they need to be organized under one banner or one leader. Like the Empire State Building, a building can house many enterprises. Central Park East Secondary School is located in a building that houses more than a thousand students, but there are three schools there. Because schools must be small enough for teachers to know kids, for kids to know teachers, for parents and teachers to interact. They must be human sized communities, run by strong adults, with the power to make important on-site decisions.

Fifth, parents need choice, just as the middle class and rich have always had. Parents should be able to choose between quality schools and should have the assistance of professionals whose task it is to evaluate these schools on their behalf.

At Central Park East, ours is a deliberately small school. We cannot prevent tragedy or shield our students from the harsh outside world, but we can and do, because we are small, teach them that they are valuable and that their ideas and beliefs, their minds and hearts count to us. If we had 4,000 students instead of 500, we

could not do that. There would be just too many tragedies and we would be in a state of perpetual mourning.

Two weeks ago we dealt simultaneously with the death of a beloved school secretary, the loss in a fire of a member of one student's family, and the tragic events in Central Park. A week or two later we had to deal with the sudden and shocking death of the first black superintendent of schools for New York City, which also affected our children. We have dealt with each of these seriously, thoughtfully, and deeply. That is one way to help people learn that we love life, respect all people, and cherish each other. Anything less—and for most of our children, they get far less—anything less teaches them to withdraw their humanity, numb their hearts, and begin to accept more and more that violence as a norm.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Deborah Meier follows:]

Prepared Statement of Deborah Meier, Principal of the Central Part East Secondary School in East Harlem, New York, NY

Good Morning. My name is Deborah Meier. I am the Principal of the Central Park East Secondary School in East Harlem and the Jackie Robinson complex, in which Central Park East Secondary School is located. I also serve as a leader of the Center for Collaborative Education, an organization of parents, teachers and students from six public schools in New York which share a common approach to education. Some of these schools are located in Manhattan's District 4 -- a pioneer in permitting parents to choose the school their children will attend from among a variety of educational styles and philosophies. I am here, of course, representing my own views, not the view of the New York City Board of Education.

The Jackie Robinson complex includes several schools with over 1,000 students, the largest of which is CPESS. It also houses an elementary school, Central Park East I, and a small Junior High called the Music Academy. We are located at Madison Avenue and East 106th St on the edge of Central Park. And we have been gripped by sadness and great introspection in the last several weeks because one of the students in the building has been charged with being part of the attack on the young woman runner in the northern part of Central Park.

My testimony today will not provide statistics, I'm sure you've been presented with these from every possible perspective.

Instead, I want to tell you about the students in my school and the staff as well as the what each faces in their daily lives, and why Congress, the Executive Branch and state governments, as well as the business and labor community, must all share responsibility for creating an environment that assures the survival of these children, and the betterment of their lives and the lives of the parents who love them.

I want to tell you about the impact schooling has on their attitude toward and propensity for violence.

I want to tell you about an alternative approach to schooling that could make a difference and the public policy implications that this example suggests.

Most of the young people I see daily are low income youngsters living in the inner city of Manhattan. They are largely African -American and Latino. But their attitudes are not uniquely characteristic of their culture or environment. And, I would like to remind you, not uniquely characteristic of this period in which we live. My daughter who lives and teaches 100 miles north in a small rural community tells many of the same tales -- tales of violence, drunk driving accidents, drug busts , vandalism and arson, most of them perpetrated by young people. It's also important to know that about 20 percent of the students in my

school are white and they demonstrate a remarkably similar set of values, fears and experiences.

Violence is normal in the world of today's adolescent. Even worse, it is glamorous and appealing. In advisory meetings, where people are frank and open, the boys will acknowledge that their ideal of manliness exudes violence. The girls are caught in a double bind: they're expected to adopt a veneer of toughness along with traditional female docility. To be a man is to sneer in the face of the weak. To be a woman is to worry about your man's needs.

One long evening before a blazing fire at an out-of-town retreat, the 12 and 13 year old boys talked about how rare it was for them to be able to acknowledge to each other their fears, worries and doubts. To let your guard down was an invitation to danger or cruel jests, at the very least. Weakness was equated with sissiness. To be a thoughtful person was to invite a rep for being a homosexual.

What's the difference between poor kids and the middle class when it comes to these attitudes? It's the difference partly in whether they see this attitude as a rite of passage, or a life long habit.. Middle class kids often see this conforming cruelty as a temporary necessity of adolescence, whereas working class

and poor kids seem more prone to the view that this is the way the world is ... or should be.

This attitude is, of course, reinforced by everything they see on television and in the movies, in print and broadcast advertising, in the world of business and the world of politics. From Rambo to the corporate raiders, it's the aggressive, tough-minded guys who get the job done regardless of laws and the societal constraints. They're the admirable, effective people, unlike teachers and parents, many of whom seem to struggle and work in circumstances that offer no status, glamor or money. By comparison,they seem to be less admirable to these kids, diminishing their possibility of serving as effective role models.

When policy makers look to make changes that involve youth they look to the schools first. Yet children do not start school generally until they are five or six years of age. From the time they start until they graduate or drop out, school occupies only half the days of the year and less than half of those hours are spent in school. Seeking solutions to violence that concentrate only on changing children's lives in school won't do. The violence kids experience is rarely experienced in schools. A single act of violence is serious, but it is not a daily part of most high schools. It is, however, a daily part of many young people's experiences in their neighborhoods and even in their

homes. At least as significant is changing the communities in which these kids live and the resources available to them once the school day is over.

But schools are a critical place where society can intervene. What kind of schools are these places that we entrust our children to, and where we expect the most important preparation required by society to create a new generation of thinkers, learners, doers, workers?

If we had designed schools purposely to increase the attractions of the streets, to promote peer isolation , to undermine parental authority , to make kids sneer at "culture," we would have designed them like America's junior and senior high schools.

When such schools were first designed few youngsters were expected to complete them. A small elite, hungry for learning or getting ahead, took honors classes, joined school clubs, were leaders of their student governments and yearbook editors. The rest did as little as was necessary. Some dropped out to go to work, some got pushed out, most attended classes without interest. It was not till WW II that the average American was expected to graduate from high school. And, it was not until quite recently that all our citizens and our workforce were expected to meet high intellectual standards. Therefore, whatever their merits or shortcomings, American schools were not intended

to do the job we expect of them today. To do that different job you need a very different kind of school.

We created schools that treated kids and still treat kids as a fungible mass. We built buildings to house 1,500 to 4,000 students of about the same age (and thus presumably the same needs), organized on a factory model. But, in fact, even the mass production industries never tried anything as anonymous and mindless. Our kids are expected to spend their time going from one disconnected subject to another every 35-45 minutes with a few minutes in between. Bells announce switches and movement from place to place, preferably with as little noise, discussion of what had just transpired in the last class, or opportunity to compare notes and process ideas. Math follows English, Home Economics follows literature--and then we wonder that young people fail to notice the connections between subjects, or forget one year what they learned the last, or lack attention spans, can't stick with anything, or rarely get serious.

And what do we do to the teachers in these schools? They see some 150-160 students each day, each semester confronting a different 160 students. The kids come in groups of 25-35 sitting in rows to receive their daily dose of information, review homework, take tests and quizzes.

For the teacher, there is hardly any opportunity and certainly no incentive to compare notes with colleagues, linger with students at the end of the class or even think about an idea which might change your presentation in the next class. There is no time to know the students, their personalities, their peculiar learning styles, their names, faces. A teacher dares not give homework that requires anything more than perfunctory review. Just think, if each of the 160 students required two minutes of homework review time, the teacher would spend five hours each night just marking homework assignments. Thus the tradition of spending at least half of each short class period reviewing the student's homework. High expectations under such a system means simply rewarding those who come to school with the work done.

Think of America's schools like a badly organized conference that goes on for 185 days, day after day. Lots of plenary sessions where one is endlessly talked at. An occasional panel or video, few breaks, no time for talking with ones colleagues, poor food and refreshments, and a few bad tempered presenters who yell at the audience or belittle a conference attendee who falls asleep at the back of the auditorium. Why would we go to such a conference? Only to see old friends, network, meet new acquaintances. And that's exactly what the kids do.

Of course even the worse conference we attend is usually in a pleasant surrounding. But the settings for at least most urban

students and teachers is at best dreary and at worst shameful. Bathrooms are "kids-only" territory which wise adults avoid., as do many kids. They rarely have towels, soap, mirrors or any of the comforts we adults associate with a ladies or men's room in a modern office. Don't you think it odd, that we don't provide these amenities, but then spend money to improve the self image of "at risk" kids?

Teachers -- adults -- work without the basic facilities that the poorest office permits: telephones, computers, copying machines, typewriters, support staff. No time or place for professional privacy from the students. The message is clear...the only time you are a teacher is when you stand up in front of a class.

And how do we treat parents in these schools? Not much better. We do not require employers to let them visit schools during the day. We schedule appointments and visits at a time which either requires them to lose pay or come late after their regular jobs in order to hear a teacher's report about test scores, grades or attendance. We rarely discuss what that parent can do or should do, because we really have nothing to offer them. We've done our duty, told the tale, and now we can move on.

What do we do to tell kids to stay in school? We invite wildly successful rock stars or athletes who urge kids to graduate, and say they wish they had too. But that may in fact be

counterproductive because the kids can see how little difference it made.

Thus the school offers little to kids in the way of powerful adult figures who are in control, thinking about interesting ideas, doing exciting things, speaking with enthusiasm about education. Instead they find school a pale substitute for the exciting and dangerous world of the street, pop culture and TV mirages. Danger is no deterrent. Immortality hangs in the air. Adolescents properly seek ways to overcome handicaps, excel and conquer obstacles.

The majority of young people's time is spent out of school, with families, in communities, heavily influenced by popular culture. Certainly we have to raise questions about contemporary culture, and the false images and ideas it projects to youth. But we must remember that it is a culture which emanates from the powerful, largely white, wealthy adults who run American business. It's not a culture designed by these children.

And what has happened to the families which are supposed to provide alternative adult values to these children? Both middle class and poor families, as well as teachers do spend a great deal of time telling kids what is right and what is wrong. And both middle class and poor families work many hours to provide their kids with a secure way of life. The difference is that the

middle class winds up with the resources to provide children with after school activities, tutors, cultural enrichment all of which reinforces the parent's message. Poor families have all they can do to provide shelter, food and clothing.

If we want families to become tougher guardians of their youngsters we need to change the power relationships between the parents and the kids. Parents can exert power when they are seen as protectors. They can be fruitful models for children, when their resources, time and energy permit them to do so. Such parents can afford to make kids angry by asserting their power to protect. But where parents are seen as powerless, have no resources and dare not say, "no", because they fear children will go elsewhere, to more dangerous places, doing more dangerous things, then parents are not in the driver's seat anymore.

These are not just problems of style, culture or design. These are problems rooted in public policy. Young people's sense of being valued and valuable is not a matter of a commercial message or some public relations trick. They will know they are valuable and valued when they and their families are treated so.

If parents have no decent housing, job, health care, if, in fact, their kids can make more than they, if they must beg the authorities and the government for every bit of help they

receive, if parents are demeaned by our leaders and by the media, then their children will regard them in the same way.

There must be a renewed, visible national commitment to end the racism and sexism that still dominates our public and private lives. Things may be better than they were thirty years ago, but

that does not mean much to my students. They are children now and their pain is now. They cannot live on comparisons.

We must spend money on children, quite apart from their schooling. We need to use the facilities we already have in a more sensible way. Our schools are brick and mortar. They can house much more activity than takes place in the standard school day. They need to become part of a vast expanding network of facilities available to young people, with well-paid supervision of the kinds of programs the rich use for their youngster's after school hours. Camp facilities, swimming pools, libraries, music classes, clubs of all sorts. The fellowship of friends engaged in exciting activities--we need to offer these to youngsters rather than empty hours in front of television sets watching expensively produced videos that feed their feelings of emptiness, powerlessness and loneliness.

Then we need to address the nature of schools. Just because we built big, centralized buildings, the buildings needn't be

organized under one banner or leader. Schools buildings, like the Empire State Building, can house many different enterprises. The school can be and must be small. Small enough for teachers to know kids, and kids to know each other. Small enough for parents to interact with teachers, and small enough for staffs to convey to parents and students and each other the values, ideas that particular school cares for and believes in.

And, I firmly believe all parents need what the middle class and wealthy parent has always had...choice. That means the right to choose between accessible alternatives that are subject to evaluation. Elementary and secondary schools need teams of visiting evaluators just as schools of higher education are evaluated now by accreditation boards. The cost of funding visiting teams of evaluators is not any more expensive than we spend today to administer the vast nationwide standardized testing programs which we have been fooled to believe holds our schools accountable. These tests represent mindless accountability--accountability which has proven again and again to be useless and even damaging.

At Central Park East Secondary School we pay attention to our kids and their families. We are partners in a collaborative effort:

- to teach young people how to think;
- to rethink our own ideas about teaching and learning;
- to offer parents access to our approach and techniques;

- o to help parents and students alike set goals that allow them to make sure their values are part of what we are offering their children;
- o that allow children to understand why their parents lives are admirable.

Ours is deliberately a small school, nurtured by a District committed to educational choices for the poor, as well as for the wealthy and staffed by adults who have extensive on-site power to make decisions. We cannot prevent tragedy from striking, nor can we immunize our school community from the greater world. But because we are small, we can respond to our students in a way that tells them they and their ideas are valuable. That's how kids learn compassion. At CPESS we can and do practice such compassion. It is both caring and tough. But if our school had 4,000 students we couldn't dare offer such care or we would be in perpetual grief. There are simply too many daily tragedies to contemplate in such a population of poor, urban people. But gratefully, we are small, and so in one week we have been able to deal simultaneously with the death of a beloved school secretary, the loss in a fire of members of one student's family and the tragic event in Central Park. And now, most recently, the sudden death of the first Black superintendent of schools for New York City. We have dealt with these seriously and deeply. That's one way we help young people to learn that we love life, respect all people and cherish each other.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you.
Mr. Loken.

STATEMENT OF GREGORY A. LOKEN, ESQ., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE FOR YOUTH ADVOCACY AND A SENIOR STAFF ATTORNEY AT COVENANT HOUSE, NEW YORK CITY, NY

Mr. LOKEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am very grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, to Congressman Bliley, and all the members of the committee for allowing me to comment on a topic that we confront every day at Covenant House; that is, violence among American teenagers.

For the last nine years I've been an attorney and advocate for the kids who come to Covenant House off the street in New York City. Currently, our Covenant House program shelters about 16,000 kids in a number of different American cities. They are runaway, homeless kids, under the age of 21.

A few of them arrive at Covenant House fresh off the bus, with no experience of life on the street, but many, many more arrive with the violent desperation in their eyes that can strike terror even in the heart of a seasoned New Yorker.

The kids that we see at Covenant House are kids who have been victimized by violence all their lives, and they are kids who are now being caught up in the whole cycle of violence that threatens all of us in this country. Half of the kids who come to our New York health clinic, even for routine care, bear scars of gun wounds or knife wounds. Most of the kids who come into our programs have been the victim of serious, physical abuse at home—that is, abuse in which the abuse has left marks on their body or in which they were forced to go to the hospital. An independent study of the kids in one of our programs found that 70 percent or more had been the victims of serious sexual abuse at some time in their lives.

These children come from extremely unstable families and unstable neighborhoods. Only 10 percent or less in our New York program have come from intact families when they arrive to us. Far fewer than that can return to those families when they leave.

Now, because they're in this kind of chaotic environment, they turn to other kinds of supports. They turn to television, which as many of my fellow panelists have commented, offers a steady diet of violence, a steady diet of superficial relationships and commitments, and they turn frequently in the larger cities, especially in New York and Los Angeles, some of the biggest cities in this country, to gangs, or now "posses" in New York, where they find a sense of belonging that they have not been able to find at home or in their neighborhoods.

Eventually, the life that they have led at home leads them to the street, either as part of a natural progression or as part of a kind of violent break with their parents. But on the street they find even more violence, even more chaos.

Half or more are forced to trade sex for shelter or for money or for drugs. A substantial minority commit petty crimes in order to survive. But a rising number of the kids we see at Covenant House now are turning to trafficking in illegal drugs to support their lives on the street. Forty percent or more of the kids in our New York

program have serious drug abuse problems, overwhelmingly with crack.

This is one subject I want to mention because I don't agree with the view that there is not an increasing problem, at least with regard to young people in central urban areas regarding violence. There is an enormous increase in violence among those kids—certainly in New York City, which I know better—because simply of crack, because crack is different, crack stimulates the people who take it to violent measures, and the industry that sells and distributes crack is based on violence.

Now, in trying to focus for this hearing, I thought of many of the recommendations that my fellow panelists have given you, and I agree with the vast majority of them. I want to focus on three areas.

First of all is the area of illegal drugs, because I think here we have one specific cause of rising violence among teenagers that can be effectively addressed if we have the willpower to do it. What I recommend strongly is that this committee ask the Federal Government to focus virtually all of its efforts in the drug area domestically on protecting kids under the age of 21 from being caught up in the drug industry, either as participants or consumers. This means giving priority to law enforcement related to the protection of kids, and it means giving kids under 21 absolute priority in getting into drug treatment programs, which they do not currently enjoy. It is very hard. It can take us up to ten weeks, sometimes three or four months, to get a young person into a drug program in New York. A kid who's on crack needs crack sometimes every hour. It is impossible to tell him that he has to wait three months to get into a drug program, that we have no recourse but to ask him to wait.

Secondly, we have got to increase the options that are available to kids who are on the street now. The Federal Government, for the last 15 years, has run an exemplary program, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act program, title III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, but it's a very small program. It has not been funded to even keep up with inflation from the time of its enactment. It is incredibly inadequate to deal with the hundreds of thousands of kids who are on the streets of this country. We have got to find ways to increase that.

One way, in addition to what I mentioned in my written testimony, is to simply, as an incentive for funding in this Act, require the States to provide funding and to provide statutory frameworks for the provision of runaway and homeless youth services. Very few States in this country have a runaway and homeless youth act. Very few States focus clearly on the problems of kids on the street in their welfare systems. We have got to find a way, on the Federal level, to encourage them to look at that problem. I sometimes think the Federal runaway program, by not having that kind of an incentive, may allow some State officials to get off the hook by claiming that the Federal Government is actually the one who is taking care of this problem.

Finally, this committee, I think, has a very special role in this country as an advocate, as a place of research. I think you have very special influence which you have used very effectively in the

past, and I think you can increase in the future. I would ask you to use that influence in a couple of different ways.

First of all, I would ask you to challenge the churches of this country—the national religious organizations I guess are the best ones for you to relate to directly—but challenge them to begin to focus clearly on the problems of young teenagers, kids aged 10 to 15 or 18. Because the churches in this country are a possible backup to the family as a way of reaching these kids, teaching them values, involving them in community service, and also giving them a social network that is positive and constructive for their future. If this committee would issue such a challenge and hold churches accountable for failing to live up to it, I don't think you would be violating any separation of church and state. You would simply be informing the public what your views are on this. I think it is a proper use of your moral authority. Indeed, you do have moral authority.

Secondly, I have to agree very strongly with most of my fellow panelists regarding violence in the media and especially on television. This committee, by publicizing those programs which are particularly obnoxious in teaching values of violence to kids, by strongly attacking those broadcasters who encourage violence, I think that can go a long way to legitimize parents protest groups against violence and can legitimize boycott actions against broadcasters who try to use violence as a sop to kids. We have simply got to stop peddling violence to children in this country. We have got to make it unprofitable to do that.

I am grateful to be here. The kids we see at Covenant House come to us after a long road of violence in their lives. I think that your efforts here, the efforts of all of us in this room, will make a big difference in deciding whether the road ahead for them is going to be even more violent.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Gregory A. Loken follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GREGORY LOKEN, ESQ., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE FOR YOUTH ADVOCACY AND A SENIOR STAFF ATTORNEY AT COVENANT HOUSE, NEW YORK CITY, NY

Mr. Chairman, Congressman Bliley, and members of the Select Committee, I am very grateful for this chance to appear before you to discuss a topic that shapes--and all too often frustrates--our work at Covenant House, violence against and by American adolescents.

I am Executive Director of the Institute for Youth Advocacy and a senior staff attorney at Covenant House in New York. Over the past twenty years our work at Covenant House has brought us face to face with some of the most troubled youth in the entire country: those who have been cast adrift on the streets of our cities and forced to invent ways to survive, and reasons to go on surviving. It has been our privilege to attempt to offer these children and teenagers not just crisis shelter and services, but relationships built on a covenant of absolute respect and unconditional love.

The challenge of such relationships is as much to avoid sentimentalism as to establish trust. We are sentimental neither about the violence of street life as our kids are forced to live it, nor about the violence in the homes and in the culture that shaped them. Love for these young people compels us to look clearly at the conditions in which they have grown up and in which they live, and to admit frankly to ourselves the responsibility we all share for the good and evil in their lives. Respect for them requires equally that we help them understand that responsibility for their actions ultimately rests on their shoulders, and their consciences, alone.

At Covenant House we can chronicle, but cannot pretend fully to understand, the violence that has increasingly infected the heart of adolescent culture in many neighborhoods and cities. For the young people we try to help, physical, sexual, and emotional violence is virtually all they have ever known, and for many has entered root and branch into their daily lives. The Committee can judge for itself whether their experience is, in part at least, a reflection of teenage life in this country generally. We do believe, however, that certain changes in society and in government policy could substantially reduce the violence that our children suffer and inflict.

I. Violence in the Lives of Street Youth

Over 16,000 children and teenagers under age 21 come to Covenant House programs in New York, Houston, Fort Lauderdale, New Orleans, Anchorage, Toronto, Los Angeles, and Central America every year. Covenant House turns no

youth away who asks for shelter or services--our "open intake" commitment--but even in the cities in which our programs currently exist we serve only a fraction of homeless and runaway youths. Worse, many of the young people who do come to us are already so damaged that we cannot, in the context of crisis care, provide them real healing. We honestly admit our limitations and our failures with many street youth because it helps us learn to find new ways to try to help them, and because others need to understand how deep and serious their wounds are.

It is not hyperbole, nor even metaphor, to describe the youths at Covenant House as wounded. Thus over half of the boys young men who receive even routine medical treatment at our clinic in New York carry on their bodies the scars of previous gunshot or knife wounds. A majority of Covenant House youths have been so seriously physically abused at home that hospitalization was required or scars are still visible. A recent study in one of our programs found that over 70 percent of the sample reported a serious incident of sexual abuse in their past; for 30 percent of the boys and 50 percent of the girls this incident was in an incestuous context. Twenty-four percent told the researchers that they had been raped at least once in the past.

Their lives have been as unstable as they have been violent. Only a tiny fraction--in New York less than ten percent--of the youth we see have come from intact, two-parent homes. By contrast, about half have previously been in foster care, where some of them have been moved through dozens of placements. Drug and alcohol abuse is rampant in the homes of those who have been living with parents or relatives. In such environments it is quite literally impossible for children and adolescents to receive even a mite of the love, guidance, and discipline they need for healthy growth.

When children with such chaos and betrayal in their backgrounds arrive at Covenant House, they bring with them another sorrow, the brutal legacy of life on the street. Often, especially for boys, their street life began well before they left home, as they sought from equally damaged peers the sense of belonging that they were denied elsewhere. "Gangs," "posses," and the like provide that sense of acceptance at a terrible price to society and often to the members themselves, but the vitality of gang culture in spite of that price shows how great is the adolescent need to belong.

With or without transition, life on the street is cruel and deadly. About one half of the youths who come to Covenant House have been sexually exploited during their time on the street, and according to one study, 32 percent have been asked to participate in sexually explicit photos.

In a recent cooperative study between Covenant House New York and the New York State Department of Health, the HIV infection rate among the youth sampled in our clinic was 7 percent, climbing to over 10 percent among 20-year-olds.

Of those young people who come to Covenant House repeatedly, our most recent research indicates that nearly one in seven admit to involvement in drug dealing; one in five admits to committing other crimes to survive. If asked where they spent their last three days, 53 percent will answer that their only option was to sleep on the street, on a subway or in a bus terminal, or with a john. Of the rest many will say they have stayed with a "friend", but on closer questioning the "friend" will usually turn out to be someone they have known less than a month. In one sense, then, it is possible to explain their criminal, and not infrequently violent, behavior as a simple act of desperation.

In the last four years, however, a new source of violence among youth on the street has become frighteningly powerful. Crack is the first illegal drug that has produced widespread addiction among Covenant House clients, although lesser degrees of substance abuse, especially alcohol abuse, have always been a part of street life. Crack is different, though, not just in its affordability and its capacity to make addicts out of kids. It is a powerful stimulant that in our experience directly causes violent behavior by many who use it. (For many it causes suicidal behavior as well, violence no less tragic because directed at the self.) The siege of murder and assault inflicted on huge portions of New York City over the past several years can only be explained, we believe, in relation to crack and the industry that manufactures and distributes it. Because the drug itself creates such a high risk of addiction and violence, we think they are seriously mistaken who call for its legalization as a means of reducing drug-related violence.

II. Directions for Action

Because time is short today, and because time to prepare for this hearing has been short as well, it is impossible to consider more than a few areas of action to reduce youthful violence. As a beginning, we suggest the following:

A. Youth Priority in the War on Drugs. Illegal drugs, especially crack, are turning thousands of children into addicts who commit crime and who engage in prostitution to support their habits, and who commit random acts of violence while "high". We believe that the federal effort against drug abuse should concentrate its always limited resources on providing immediate access to treatment programs for

youth under age 21. Federal law enforcement efforts should likewise be concentrated on punishing those who sell crack and other hard drugs to children and adolescents.

B. Alternatives to the Street. Much of the violence by youth on the streets of this country is the simple result of the desperation they feel when their options run out, when no family, no relatives will give them shelter and help. Young people who are violent on the street are rarely violent inside the walls of Covenant House and of other runaway and homeless youth programs around the country. Yet thousands, indeed tens of thousands of youths are annually turned away from shelters because of lack of space. We think it is a scandal that the entire annual federal budget for runaway and homeless youth programs has remained under $30 million for the entire decade of the 1980's. At present small private donors, ordinary taxpayers of no great means, are contributing over $50 million a year to support Covenant House's programs alone. We challenge the federal government at least to match that sum in its appropriation for Title III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act.

Further, we urge the Committee to consider the need for longer-term programs for homeless youths, programs that focus on their specific needs. Thus we have established at Covenant House a special program for HIV-positive youth, and a different long-term program for substance abusers. Our Rights of Passage program offers street kids one to two years of training in independent living, career-oriented job placement, remedial education, values-oriented character development in a residential setting. We invite you to visit any or all of these programs, and we ask you to consider the need for variety and experimentation in responding to the needs of homeless teenagers as you shape government policy.

C. Challenging Communities to Challenge Kids. In confronting youthful violence, however, it would be wrong to assume too great a role for government. Children and teenagers who commit violent deeds are most often beyond the effective reach of government, not able to comprehend its punishments or its incentives. As Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay concluded in their seminal work, Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas in 1942, "[d]elinquency . . . has its roots in the dynamic life of the community." It is in the family, the neighborhood, the school, the church and the media that children encounter the forces that most encourage or discourage violent behavior.

While the work of this Committee has affected all of these institutions through helping to shape their relationship with government, you can have, we believe, a particularly direct and substantial influence, on at least two of them: churches and the media. Neither is subject to

government control, but both are extremely sensitive to public scrutiny and pressure. And you have the power to educate and influence the public, as you have proved often in the past.

Churches and all religious organizations should be challenged by government officials to provide a comprehensive program of community service, values education, and social life for all their teenage members. At present few religious bodies pay close attention to children from age 10 to 18, and it is an enormously costly omission. Churches, synagogues and other faith-centered groups can provide precisely the peer support, the guidance, and the sense of belonging that so many dysfunctional families cannot (and that so many youth gangs currently do). Obviously government officials and committees cannot mandate what religious groups do, but you can openly challenge the largest national religious organizations to take immediate action in this area. Later you can report on what they have done, and failed to do. We think the impact of such a challenge could be great and immediate, and we urge you to consider it.

We also ask that similar challenge be directed at those who shape the media in this country, especially television programmers. As television has come to dominate the free hours of America's children, it has become increasingly violent and lurid in content. Most Americans are sick of this trend, and angry at the networks for refusing to reverse it. Although you cannot constitutionally control the content of television shows, you can most certainly tell the public which ones are particularly bad for children to watch, and which ones seem to portray children in an unhealthy or dangerous light. Because of your visibility and credibility, many parents would heed your advice. More important, many broadcasters would likely rethink their approach to programming in the face of specific and careful criticism.

Ours is an individualistic culture that prefers, if only marginally, random violence to repression. It is thus one that may play into the worst features of the adolescent search for worth and identity, by downplaying personal restraint and emphasizing skepticism about common values. At Covenant House we are continually confronted with the personal courage and beauty of the kids who come to us, and the incredible ugliness of the world from which they come. They deserve better than to be considered beyond hope, but their hope lies as much in reforming ourselves as in our efforts to reform them.

Again, please accept my gratitude for your gracious invitation to appear today, and my best wishes for your extremely important work on behalf of children.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you.

It was all interesting testimony, interesting, I guess, in the sense that each of you, in one form or another, is at the eye of the storm in this problem, with the institutions that you work with and the population that you work with.

I would have to say that, for the most part, your recommendations are really out of kilter with where politicians are going on this subject. If I read it correctly, without regard to party or interest or political stripe, it looks to me like the bandwagon is continuing to head down the road of stiffer and stiffer penalties, longer penalties, more severe penalties. It looks to me like it is headed in that direction, rather than anything that any of you have suggested in terms of starting to straighten out the environment in which either these children are harmed or in which they harm other children. I think that's interesting to note.

I think the concern is, when I listen to my colleagues in the Congress, there is a sense that somehow there is a need to separate out the perpetrators of violence, if you will, almost in a sense that it might give society an opportunity to catch its breath and to then think about the problem. But when you're losing 400 people a year in the District of Columbia, you don't have much time to think about putting new turf on the football fields and new nets on the hoops or providing a league.

People just seem to be overwhelmed by violence. When something happens to the extent that happened in Central Park, with the brutal assault on that young woman, that sends fear through the entire community. Many people who didn't think they could be subjected to that kind of violence all of a sudden found it was so random that obviously they could. All they had to be was in a different place that night and they could have been subject to eight or ten acts of violence. There's a sense that it's out of control, so you've got to get it under control, and then maybe we can have the luxury of talking about some of the things that you brought up and what this committee has been talking about for a long time. I think, also, the portrait that you paint is that we now have victim and victimizer so clearly wrapped up in one entity at this point that it's very difficult to separate them.

Sometimes I think this committee becomes a lot of one-liners that you hear from witnesses. But I remember listening to a woman who grew up in an alcoholic family, with a great deal of violence, and then married a gentleman who was an alcoholic, who beat her. She tried it again, the same thing. Until she was maybe 40 years old, she finally said to the committee, "I thought that was normal. That's the way my mother dealt with it and that's the way my sisters dealt with it, and that's the way I dealt with it. I thought that was normal until I got help. I didn't know that that wasn't supposed to happen."

I am just concerned that what you're suggesting is that almost every institution that children now come in contact with, in fact, reinforces violent behavior, either by default or by intention, whether it's the Saturday morning cartoons or the Saturday matinee, or it may be behavior at school or the streets or the family, that this now is simply saying that violence is the way you resolve your conflicts. What we are seeing, obviously, is that the conflicts

are becoming more and more petty and the violence greater and greater—you know, tennis shoes for your life, a place in line for your life, a cab for your life. I don't think people thought that 20 years ago.

Let me ask you something, Judge Walton. You straddle both sides of this, I think, in the sense that as a judge, you have to make those determinations. When you look at these kids, you've got to decide punishment, rehabilitation, second chance, no chance. You have to sort these things out. The brief on you is that you're thoughtful but you're a hard sentencer, so we'll find out here.

What kind of kids are coming before you now? Tell me, does the kid bring his or her family to court? What does this kid look like, what's the profile?

Judge WALTON. Many of the young people do not bring their families, or their families don't come to court with them. If there is a family present, it is usually the mother or the grandmother. It is rare that you ever see a father in court with the child.

Chairman MILLER. Do you ever summon the father to be there?

Judge WALTON. Well, many of them can't be located. That's the difficulty. But no, I have never personally done that.

In all probability, if the father is not playing a role in the child's life, it probably isn't going to help to bring him into the child's life because he will probably bring negative aspects of his life into the child's environment.

I also, unfortunately, have seen a deterioration of the remorse that one used to see when individuals were before the court charged with serious offenses, not only for children but also for the older people who come before the court. There just seems to be a lack of feeling in reference to the acts of violence that they have perpetrated.

I do feel that stern punishment is appropriate, when necessary. I do not believe that we can permit young people to take lives, to commit severe acts of violence, and let that conduct go unpunished. At the same time, I do believe that we have to put in place mechanisms that hopefully cause young people not to come into the system. So if you call that straddling the fence, I guess to some degree it is, because I do believe that many of our young people are salvageable, but we have to get them before they come into the system. Because once they come into the system——

Chairman MILLER. What I meant by straddling is that you end up having to make these determinations on where you're going to allocate the resources and to which kids. I think the impression that we're certainly being given on a daily basis in the press is that you're dealing with tougher and tougher kids, more and more violent, and with fewer and fewer resources. You're sort of where all the firing is taking place.

Judge WALTON. Well, that is very true. I am seeing young people coming into the court who appear to be unquestionably a lot more hardened than those that we used to see a few years ago. For those young people, I think, unfortunately, to a large degree, there is not a lot that we can do to help them. But for those who are not yet in the system, or for those who have just initially come into the system, I think we have to have in place mechanisms that hopefully will deter them from escalating their criminal activity.

Chairman MILLER. Do you get the sense, when a young person comes to your court, that they have the feeling they're in trouble now?

Judge WALTON. I know from some things that people have said to me that young people have an appreciation of the reputation of the judge that he or she is going to come in contact with. I think to some degree, if young people appreciate that negative conduct is not going to be tolerated, that that can have a positive impact on their conduct. I make young people toe the line because I think most young people, if required, will respond. But unfortunately, I think all too often we don't challenge our young people enough and that many of them need guidance and they need that strong arm of either a parent or, if it happens to be the law, the law. Many times, if they receive that, you will see a change in conduct.

Chairman MILLER. Dr. Bell, you described the pressures and the stress and the environment that some of these young people are growing up with and living with almost on a 24-hour basis, that they really don't have the possibility of escaping it. Whether they go to school, go home, or go to the corner store, it is in the environment.

When they get to the end of the process, where they finally get to a judge who says, "All right, I say no and I mean it", if I read these descriptions, that may be the first time in their life where they've encountered that. Again, looking back at testimony before this committee, when we had a number of gang members in here, one of the young people answered the question "why does your mother let you belong to a gang?", and the young boy from Philadelphia said "sometimes the child is bigger than the parent." So this business that somebody else can enforce discipline or enforce a pattern of behavior, or reinforce good behavior, along with Ms. Meier's testimony, suggests that they don't have that status in the community to do that, where it's even available.

I mean, I wouldn't be surprised if they didn't take Judge Walton at his word. They say, hell, I'll be out of here in a little while.

Dr. BELL. There are two types of kids. There are kids which are socialized—they're referred to by psychiatrists as socialized conduct disorder, and then there is unsocialized conduct disorder. The socialized conduct disorder children are children who are able to make attachments, have ethics, have friendships and have loyalties. The unsocialized children will rob from their own mother.

My experience has been—There's a woman in Wisconsin, Anne Sulton, who's a lawyer and psychologist, and she's been through every gang, youth violence prevention program in the country. She is very clear that the model which works best is to identify the child that is socialized, give that child some adult supervision, either through athletics or through jobs, because children who have jobs can be dissuaded from getting into the illegitimate economy because they've been shut out of the legitimate economy. Those children can be steered, as a result of the significant relationship, away from doing violent, illegitimate kinds of activities. So that's one issue, jobs, teenagers who have jobs.

Sister Fatah in Philadelphia, they stopped the gang wars in Philadelphia in 1974 by getting these kids a safe place to be, get-

ting them some adult supervision that was ethnically relevant, and then getting them jobs.

The other issues that you have to be very clear about—and I've been all over the country, and the conceptual unclarity is phenomenal—you've got to separate instrumental violence from expressive violence. Instrumental violence is where, if I don't have a watch and you have one, I'm going to use violence as an instrument to get your watch. That's a criminal justice kind of an issue.

Expressive violence has absolutely nothing to do with what I'm going to gain. It's, you know, you stepped on my toe, I'm in a bad mood, I've had a head injury, I've been in a family where there's violence, I've been violent all my life, I've been violent in schools, no one has ever said anything to me about it. I'm socializable, but I still pop off every so often. And then somebody commits a murder. That is the majority of the homicides in the country. Most of the violence in this country is expressive. It is not instrumental. You are not going to have solutions for expressive violence by addressing instrumental violence issues. It's just not going to happen.

Chairman MILLER. Judge Walton, what do you think about what Dr. Bell has said?

Judge WALTON. I tend to agree. I guess to some degree we're seeing, at least in the District of Columbia, a different type of homicide being committed that we didn't see before. It was rare that we had contract-type hits being committed by young people. But, unfortunately, with the crack problem, we have seen an increase in that situation. We have seen a number of individuals who were killed over turf struggles, and we have seen a number of young people who have been violently injured or killed because they didn't pay a debt. Those types of acts I think are totally different than the acts committed by someone who acts out in anger or frustration and takes a life in that manner, which was the majority of the homicides we used to see. But I have seen a change in that situation recently.

Chairman MILLER. Congresswoman Boxer.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just sitting here and, in my mind, trying to make sense out of all of this, it's very difficult.

I guess one of the things that struck me, Miss Meier, is that the kind of school you described, 35 minutes of each subject, is the kind of school I went to. I grew up in Brooklyn and I went to Brooklyn schools and it was always like that.

Where I would challenge you is that I think, out of those 35 minutes, you just might hit a really good teacher. If you hit a really good teacher, it could change it. So I don't think that to sort of scoff at the fact that it's 35 minutes and then we go somewhere, that isn't the problem in my mind. If you have really good teachers, who are paid well, who are motivated, and they have those kids for 35 minutes every single day, it is possible, assuming that it's the type of school you describe, not a huge school, that they can make an impact.

I guess the thing that is the most exceptional thing to me that hasn't been stated here is the fact that some kids survive and are terrific. I think one of the things that is missing from this discussion perhaps is how come it happens.

Now, maybe it's the kid that does have the two-parent family, but maybe it's a kid who is raised by the grandmother. The fact is, some of the kids make it. What I have been trying to concentrate on is how you take those kids who are making it and utilize them, so that the younger ones that are coming into high school somehow have an alternative to gangs and violence. We could have ten psychiatrists who can't figure out why these kids are making it. But we could utilize these kids, get them into jobs, maybe to create jobs.

Congressman Pat Williams and I have a bill—we overstate the name of it and call it "Save the Children". It isn't going to do that. But it's a thought. What you do is you take these kids who are making it, give them decent paying jobs to work with the little kids who are coming in. These are their peers. What you do then is you pay a star teacher who is recommended by the principal and voted on by the students to work with these kids, so that you get a star teacher and star kids working with these little kids.

It seems to me that all the TV in the world—and it's a long-term process to draw the line between censorship. These are tough issues that this committee can't solve. But we already have kids out there who are making it. Maybe we could figure out a way to utilize those kids with the little ones coming in. I will stop in a minute to get your reaction.

I think, in order to really solve this problem—and we have to believe we can solve it; otherwise, none of us would be doing what we're doing, is to almost divide it into three pieces. First of all, it would be the little, tiny kids, the little babies, the 0 to 11. For those kids, we have to have 100 percent success. We have to get to those kids early. Congressman Miller knows how to do it. He wrote the WIC program. He knows about prevention strategies and we know about Head Start and we know what works with kids. We've got to service 100 percent of those eligible kids in Head Start. We know it works. That's one group.

The next group is a tougher group. It is the high-risk kids that didn't have those advantages we're going to give the little ones, who we have to cope with in ways that are difficult. I don't know the solutions and it does involve maybe "tough love" and some of the other things we have to do.

Then it seems to me the next group of kids are those who are having kids, the parenting, and to get to every pregnant woman, and hopefully to the father, if there's a way, and begin to teach these kids who are having kids that they now have a responsibility that's a lot greater than they ever thought, somehow to rescue them from the pressures of their lives.

It seems to me that you've got to separate the problem out because it's just too overwhelming. So I would like your response from the panel to the notion of having maybe a few different strategies here rather than one big "what are we going to do" strategy.

Secondly, the notion of utilizing these fabulous teachers and kids that we have out there who are making it. I would like your reaction.

Mr. LOKEN. Congresswoman Boxer, I strongly agree with your approach. As I was mentioning earlier, I think that at least our interest is primarily with that high-risk group.

But we haven't focused enough on the passage to adolescence that kids go through, after about age 11. We have got to find ways to get them through that in a constructive way. I think the program you're suggesting has a lot of promise.

I would add to that the idea of perhaps making it a requirement of being in student offices in high schools and being on student councils in high schools, to go back to junior high schools, to go back to younger grades and talk to the kids who are in those schools about what the future holds for them, show them that you can make it, that you can be positive. Because the kids who are in student offices in high schools, junior high schools, usually are high achieving kids who are very popular with younger kids who meet them. The younger kids feel very happy to meet the president of the student body of the local high school. I think those are stars that you might want to add to your program.

Ms. MEIER. Yes, many of us went to schools and were successful. But I think it's important to remember that children weren't all successful in the past and many of them left school. But the alternatives to leaving school weren't as frightening and weren't as terrible. The strengths they got from other institutions made up for strengths that we now expect schools to provide. So the question of a sane and sensible organization of schools which really can be supportive of the kind of values, both intellectual and compassionate, that we want for our children, becomes of far greater importance.

So while people survive some of the most terrifying things in the world, if we don't change the kinds of settings to make these things less likely then that's what they have to do; they have to be that strong to get through. The American high school is almost designed as though we were trying to put together everything we know, that just common sense tells us is antithetical to what children need, both intellectually and morally.

You talk about that wonderful teacher. The American high school teacher sees 150 students every day and a different group every semester. If she spends two minutes a day reviewing the homework that you all want her to give her students every night, it would be five hours a night she would spend just grading homework assignments. As my son said to me in his senior year, in one of those 4,000 high schools in New York City, who is supposed to give me a reference for college? Who knows me here?

We don't know our kids. We can't teach compassion to kids we don't know. So we need small schools, organized so that parents and kids and teachers know each other, using those five or six hours we have in a precious way, to build some notion of what are norms between people who care about each other.

None of us work in offices in which we see so many people. None of us even work in factories which are as anonymous as the schools we send our children to. Then, of course, given those circumstances, we have to fall back on metal detectors and the whole series of other ahuman devices. I'm not objecting to those, but they are temporary solutions until we create institutions where I know the kids who are walking in and out of my school, I know who's a stranger.

I think that's not so much a question of cost, although it costs something, because major change in school organization takes a

little grease to make it easier for the people who have to play new roles. But I think it's a feasible direction, if we stop glorifying those big schools.

One of the dilemmas is that parents and adults have glorified what they see as the more charming side of adolescent violence: the big, wild high schools. Think of all the movies that glorify running from one 35 minute class to another, laughing at teachers who look like fools. It's part of the culture. So on the one hand we're sort of annoyed at kids for acting out, in school, and on the other hand we have in many ways ourselves created a kind of cheerful myth of the mindless high school.

I have kids who want to leave our school occasionally because they say, gee, isn't it part of a rite of passage to go to a crazy, wild school where we all act violently. That's sort of their notion of what it is you ought to go through, their rite of passage.

Dr. BELL. I'm one of those kids who survived, because I was in a gang, carried a gun for a few years, saw people get shot, et cetera, et cetera. So I was a gang member before I was a psychiatrist.

Chairman MILLER. Do you recommend that? [Laughter.]

Dr. BELL. There are invincible children who get lucky and who have that inner sense, so that when a geometry teacher asked me was I going to be a jerk for the rest of my life or learn something, I decided I would get him, but I would get him on his turf and happened to start learning geometry. That is the only thing that saved me. I can go back and talk to friends who were just as bright, just as intelligent, just as capable, but because they did not get that supervision, they went the other way. Gangs are just like the boys clubs, just like 4-H clubs, except you have a different purpose.

My issue is that I think a lot of the institutions have failed. If I go into a school system and I say to that school principal how many children here do you think have seen a homicide, and the numbers start popping up and the kids start raising their hands and everybody starts crying all over the place, the school counseling system has not been developed, with psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers. It's very rare that you find somebody who stopped and dealt with a 4 year old or 6 year old child who has watched their mother get stabbed to death. So there has to be some development and some ownership of the public health profession around dealing with the issue of violence, because a lot of these communities and families are underresourced and they're not going to be able to pull themselves up by their bootstraps when they don't have any boots.

So one of the things that I would recommend is that—I had an opportunity to review the public health objectives for the year 2000, and Dr. Prothrow-Stith and myself and others around the country that have been dealing with this have had some input into that. The strategies appear to be very sane and very useful. They talk about screening in emergency rooms. If a kid takes an overdose and goes to the emergency room, they pump his stomach and they counsel him. If the kids in a fight and he's in the emergency room once a week, they sew him up and send him back out. Nobody counsels the kid.

The violence prevention curriculum in the public schools that Prothow-Stith has developed, that appears to work. The fighting

decreases in those schools. Conflict resolution centers in D.C., those things work. But they are not going to work unless there is some public policy that is blessed and sent out to the States and then gets sent to the local level.

Dr. SPIVAK. I would just like to add to that very briefly. I think that your discussion about targeting various age groups and kids in a different context is very important. But I think if we lose sight of the fact that all of these kids are functioning in a larger context and are being influenced by values that we represent in many ways, then we are going to miss the boat because we are not going to be able to do the more targeted kind of work.

If we accept violence as a normal behavior, kids are going to learn that, irrespective of anything else we do with them. If we do not deal with the losses kids face, if we do not deal with the extent of violence that kids see around them, then I think we are in big trouble. I think to label issues as too big to deal with, such as messages in the media, availability of weapons, is a real disservice, because by accepting those, we are establishing our values and teaching our kids, intentionally or otherwise. I think this committee and all committees should be dealing with those issues, even with the understanding that it may take a long time to figure them out, but just dealing with them and talking about them gives an alternative message to kids that maybe something is wrong, or that maybe something needs to change.

Thank you.

Mrs. BOXER. If I could respond, I think what I'm trying to do with you is to be realistic, because I do not like to kid myself into thinking that because we hold a hearing suddenly the TV stations are going to take a look at what they're doing and George Bush is going to change his position on guns or whatever.

What I'm saying is, to turn the society around is like turning a big ship around. It's tough to do it, and we are in this business because we all want to do it. That's why we got in. So it can be done and it has to be discussed. In the meantime, we have to be realistic. What I'm suggesting is, while society begins to turn the ship in a certain direction, what we also need to do is kind of pick the pieces of the problem apart and make them able to be solved. That's all I'm saying.

But I absolutely agree with you, that the bigger issue of violence in society, of guns, of the way women are portrayed in society and all the rest, is absolutely critical. But it's going to take a long time to turn around the ship of state. So I do not want us to waste time while we are waiting for the value system to catch up.

Ms. MEIER. You know, I think everyone here on this panel spends their lives doing those little things.

Mrs. BOXER. For sure you do.

Ms. MEIER. We're taking hold of some little part of it and doing our best with it.

But some of those big things are directly legislative. I mean, issues of unemployment, the fact that—I do not know what the statistics are, but the overwhelming percentage of young men in the community that our kids live in daily have no jobs. You look at what happened to the hospitals in New York City, you look at what happened in medical care in the poorest communities. It

doesn't exist any more. Those are direct issues which can't be solved by small things, but they send a powerful message.

The media reinforces the ugly side of daily life. It wouldn't be so dangerous, that media, if it wasn't reflected in daily experience that says you're powerless, that your parents are nobodys, that none of them are respected. People talk about medical care, but in large sections of New York, and the poorest sections, which doesn't happen to be the case where my school is located, but in many of the poorest sections of New York there are no hospitals any longer, and the ones that are there are private hospitals going out of business.

So all these wonderful programs, psychiatric programs, a child coming into the kind of emergency room that you were just describing, there is no place where that happens for many of these kids. These send bad messages. We've got schools in New York that literally none of us would let our children go to, they're such physical disgraces. That sends a message to kids. It makes TV more attractive and sets them up for the TV message. It makes them so easily marketable by very powerful people who are trying to sell them bad things.

These are things that could be addressed. I'm not saying they are likely to be, at the present moment, but they could be addressed by legislative action. What happened to our hospitals? Are funds going into rebuilding our urban schools that are falling apart? In our district there are four schools whose top floors are now closed off because they're too dangerous.

These are things that are only going to be resolved with money, and they send a powerful message. So while we can't immediately maybe tackle television ads, we are reinforcing the message of those ads when we do nothing about these conditions.

Dr. BELL. I would like to see—this is a little piece, because I try to get little pieces. I would like to see a public policy around children who witness the murder of their parents in all of the major cities, because every place I have been—I think Los Angeles has one, and it took Pynoos five years to put it in place after he found out that 400 children a year in Los Angeles watch their parents being murdered. That's a little thing that every city could do.

But usually what happens is the homicide detective goes in and interviews the kid, the kid gets turned over to protective custody, the grandmother comes in and argues over who should take care of the kid, and nobody deals with how do you feel, unless it's well publicized.

Chairman MILLER. Congressman Levin.

Mr. LEVIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Select Committee, in my judgment, and I think that of many, many others, has provided an invaluable service by spotlighting certain facts. But in this case it seems to me the committee wants to go further, because a lot of these facts are now pretty old. They are still startling, some of them, but many of them are now an old, tragic song. They're a decade old, maybe two.

Just briefly, why are we having so much trouble, in your judgment, in society responding?

Dr. BELL. It's been like this since 1932.

Mr. LEVIN. I said a decade or so, and you're saying five decades. Why are we having so much trouble getting at these problems?

Ms. MEIER. You can ask the other panel members, but to me, it's very hard to know when things change, the past from the present. But I do sense among kids less of a sense that their lives are going to be better than their parents. I could be wrong, but even in the poorest black communities, parents once believed breaks would happen for their kids that didn't happen for them. I think in all kinds of communities, including white and middle-class communities, there is a greater sense that life may not be better for their kids. I think that puts parents in a vulnerable position. I think there is a vulnerability beyond everything else, of kids feeling that the adults are not a model for them to follow, because the adults can't tell them "look we're doing some things that are likely to make your lives better. We have done something, we have sacrificed so that your life may be better than ours." I think that was a powerful message.

Dr. SPIVAK. I would like to answer that. I have been working with kids now for almost 20 years, and there seems to be an increase in the sense of helplessness and hopelessness that I think is affecting how kids behave and how communities are behaving. I not only see that sense of helplessness on an individual level, but whole communities are feeling very unempowered to deal with these kinds of issues, partly for a lack of resources, partly because I think there has been a real desensitization to this whole issue of violence because it has been so extensive for so long, even though I am not sure that at a public level people have been aware of how extensive it is.

Mr. LEVIN. So why are we having so much difficulty within our society? Judge Walton, you're going to be on the firing line on this. I mean, if it's growing, my own judgment is that a lot of the problems have been there, but beginning 10, 15, 20 years ago there was a significant change in degree at that time. These are children. Our country says, and has said it forever, they're our future. So what's going on here? Why are we having so much difficulty in getting on top of this or, far from that, keeping abreast of it?

Judge WALTON. I agree that the problems have existed for a long time, but I think there clearly has been a deterioration. I think the moral fabric of society has been shredded to a certain degree, and I think the breakdown in the family structure has played a significant role in that. I also feel that, as far as the black community is concerned, there was a different attitude among blacks 15 or 20 years ago about upward mobility.

There was, at least in my home, always the desire on the part of my parents to see us have a better life than the life that they had. I think, to a large degree, young black people are not being taught the history of blacks in this country and, therefore, don't have an appreciation of why it is important that, because of the deprivations we suffered in this society, that we now do all that we can to share in the fruits that this country can provide. So I think there is a lack of history among a lot of blacks who don't have an appreciation of why it's important for us to seek to elevate ourselves. That's just my own personal view, but that's what I've seen in reference

to talking to a lot of young black kids who I come in contact with on a daily basis.

Dr. BELL. I would like to answer your question because I've been going around the country for about seven or eight years now trying to initiate community public health solutions to the problem. I found myself hitting a brick wall. I asked myself the same question, what are the obstructions to solving the problem.

It seems to me there is a lot of conceptual unclarity in the general public's mind around what the issue is. If you go into the black community, most black people will tell you that they think the reason for the high rates of victimization and homicides are from white policemen. But there are 365 police shootings a year, compared with 10,000 black-on-black homicides.

You look at Miami. When that Hispanic police officer shot the guy on the motorcycle, there was a riot. You look at the homicide rate in Miami, with that one compared to the 700 or however many. But you don't see that same sort of public outcry or interest or energy, because the newspapers mislead people and they blow up the notion that an 84 year old grandmother shoots four home invaders between the eye with her .44 magnum and everybody goes out and buys a .44 magnum. That gun is more likely to be stolen, more likely to be used in a suicide or more likely to be used in a family homicide. Everybody is thinking that if I have a gun, I can kill the home invader. That's not the case.

If you look at Detroit, prior to 1968, the Detroit homicide rate was 100 for many years. The 1968 riots occurred and gun ownership in Detroit went up five times. Everybody felt they needed a gun to protect themselves. The homicide rate in Detroit went up to 700 and it's been 700 since, because people are buying guns to protect themselves and killing family members.

There are other myths. Hispanic people kill themselves very differently from the way white people or black people kill themselves. Hispanic men rarely kill Hispanic women. Hispanic men kill each other in bars and in group situations. So if you're going to do a prevention effort for Hispanic homicides, it's going to have to be very different from black homicides, which tends to be domestic violence.

But those myths and those misconceptions and lack of conceptual clarity misdirects people all the times. The differentiation between expressive violence and instrumental violence. I've been to cities where they've imported gang experts, where they didn't have a gang. But because Washington, D.C. has cocaine—and the gang structure in D.C. isn't that set yet, and it will be—but because Washington, D.C. has captured everybody's attention in the media, everybody is talking gangs. But if you look at homicide statistics for 10 and 20 years, you will find gang-related homicide might be five percent, although in some years it may be as high as 20.

The bulk of the violence is interpersonal, family, friend. But people are very misdirected. They've got all these misconceptions. You think it's the criminal in the street that's going to kill you. It's not. It's your husband, you wife, the guy you know. We're not taking ownership of that and public health people are not taking ownership of that, and you're dumping it in criminal justice's lap, which is after the fact. The Chinese have a saying——

Chairman MILLER. If the gentleman would yield, don't you think people also become deeply concerned when they continue to see reports of unintended victims, the notion that in certain housing projects there is a belief that you have a heightened possibility of being hit by a stray bullet?

Dr. BELL. I know kids who spend their Friday and Saturday nights on the floor because of that fear.

Chairman MILLER. Kids that don't go out to play and parents that won't let them go out to play.

Dr. BELL. But if you look at the violence in the housing developments, for example, it's just like family homicide. Family homicide doesn't occur overnight. Family homicide is an escalating, repeated cycling kind of violence, which a lot of times culminates in a homicide. It's been going on for years. A lot of the violence you see in the housing developments in Chicago are little personal tiffs that escalate and result in violence.

Chairman MILLER. When we were looking at family violence a number of years ago, we were told in some instances that, where you had a homicide actually take place, the police had been to that address four or five times prior to the homicide.

Dr. BELL. Five times in 50 percent of the cases, and at least twice in 80 percent of the cases. That's a Kansas City study.

But yet, when you look at emergency rooms and how the domestic violence is handled by police, in Chicago they still don't arrest the man or detain him or do anything with him. But the Attorney General's Task Force on Family Violence clearly indicates—and they use it in Milwaukee, and domestic violence in Milwaukee is decreasing—that if you detain the man and say look, you have a choice, go to jail or go to family counseling, go to jail or go to alcoholism services, the family violence decreases.

Mr. LOKEN. Congressman Levin, one additional factor in what has happened I think in this area has to do with our artificially created concept of adolescence, which really in this century we have created a period where we isolate kids from the real world. It's an adolescent world that did not exist before this century, where we keep them out of the work force and we put them into what is essentially an artificially created institution, the public school, that we to a large extent prohibit from teaching them values because of our ideas about the role of religion in American culture.

It seems to me this is a major challenge that Government policy has presented to the rest of society, how to cope with the child labor laws, how to cope with the advent of the American public school system, and it's an area that the churches in this country especially have failed to meet because they have failed to find a way to hold on to kids in those years where they're passing into adulthood.

I work with an organization that's associated with the Catholic Church. I feel it as part of my own background as a Catholic. As a teenager, there was for me nothing to bring me into mainstream adult values. It was something I had to find my own way toward. We have got to find ways, not just in Government but outside Government, to bring value education to American teenagers. I don't think that everything is predetermined by the time that a kid is

ten years old. There is a lot that happens from the day he turns ten on. We have got to find ways to make that growth a healthy one.

Especially to pick up on something that Miss Meier mentioned, if we can encourage special kinds of relationships between kids and adults, there is nothing like a constructive relationship with one adult to make an entire difference in a kid's life. It doesn't have to be a father or a mother or even a relative. It can just be a significant adult who has the child's respect. It can make all the difference. It's what we try to do at Covenant House. Obviously, we're overwhelmed with the numbers of kids who are coming to us. But the whole basis of our program is relationship based on unconditional love and absolute respect. That is what we've got to find ways of encouraging in dealing with teenagers.

Ms. MEIER. I don't think the values question, by the way, that you've addressed very importantly, comes into conflict with church/state issues at all. Values are lived. The way a school lives out its values is what teaches kids. It's not a question of standing in front and lecturing the kids on right versus wrong. They've heard that tons of times. Anyone who thinks that's what's wrong with kids, that they haven't heard that speech enough, just don't live in schools or families. They hear lots of it.

The question is to immerse them in an environment that is deeply embedded with such values. That has got to be a nonbureaucratic, small community of people who trust each other. That means also that parents and families have to be brought into the trusting environment of that school. Parents must be treated with respect by such a school, and teachers must be treated with respect. That is a big change.

I think one of the lovely things about the school building I'm in is that right in the middle of our secondary school there is a little program for four-year-olds. We have a wide range of ages. Ideally, there is no reason why schools can't even be in office buildings and all kinds of places. There is no reason why we've had to put all our kids, sort of women and children to this side, there in these kind of isolated warehouses for six years. We all need to see what the school bathrooms look like. I wish all citizens could go in and out of schools. Ordinary Americans need to see and be in contact with their young people. They need to see them at meals and they need to see them coming in and out of school. We need to mix up the ages of kids who attend schools in the same buildings, or put other things besides schools in those buildings.

We have to ask ourselves, if we were really building institutions that in six hours a day, could have a deep impact, what would they be like? Well, in one sense, they would be like a lot of the private schools in New York City. When I look at the private schools in New York City I know we do actually know a lot about what makes more human institutions and in what ways we could teach values. It doesn't have anything to do with church/state conflict. It's got to do with making adults in those schools, parents and teachers, powerful agents that can express their values and their beliefs.

Chairman MILLER. Judge Walton?

Judge WALTON. Sometimes I think that we overemphasize how severe the problem is. Clearly, we have a problem, there's no question about that. But as I indicated earlier, the vast majority of our young people are making it. The vast majority of our young people in the inner city are positive thinking people who want to do something constructive with their lives. We have to do things to encourage that attitude to exist.

I do think there has been, unfortunately, a sense of permissiveness in our society. I know when I was growing up my love was football. That's what got me out of the environment that I was in. My coaches I knew would not tolerate certain conduct. I knew they were not going to tolerate my drinking alcohol; I knew they were not going to tolerate my smoking cigarettes. Therefore, I did not do those things.

But when we have a system in place where winning is so important that we have coaches who are prepared to accept that as permissible conduct because they don't want to lose their star athletes, then I think you encourage negative behavior. So I think we have to go back to some of the old value systems, and we have to be willing to stand up and say that, when you're wrong, you're wrong, and when you're wrong there are consequences.

Dr. SPIVAK. I think part of the issue here is, quite frankly, we have written off our inner cities in a lot of ways. Let me give you an example in Boston.

The community of Roxbury, which is primarily a poor black community, is full of billboards that advertise alcohol and cigarettes and has 124 liquor stores in it. The town of Newton, which is two miles away from there, the same population base, affluent, primarily white, has two liquor stores and no billboards, no advertising of any sort. Our suburban and more affluent communities are empowered, and they set limits on what people do to them. Our inner cities are powerless, and people come in and do anything they damned well please. The implications of that are that these negative behaviors are being advertised and reinforced and these communities are living under chronic and severe oppression.

It amazes me, quite frankly, that any kids get out of that at all, because even in the best of families and the best of circumstances, the influences that are allowed to be imposed on children are overwhelming and enormous. I think there is much legislatively that can be done to empower these communities and to speak out for these communities and do for these communities what some more affluent areas around our cities are able to do for themselves.

Chairman MILLER. Mrs. Boggs.

Mrs. BOGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank all of you.

I was detained in coming here because I have been with a group of young people from my own constituency in New Orleans, a group of black children from a school that's in an inner city setting. Surely, when you meet with these young people and see their determination, having to sell cookies and things that the young women bake, and they all sew, washing cars and so on, to be able to afford a trip to Washington to see what their Government is like and to meet with their governmental officials, it does give you a great deal of hope.

Of course, we have a beautiful new facility of Covenant House in the heart of my congressional district. I'm from New Orleans, and the old city, of course, attracts a lot of transient young people as well as having to take care of our own children who are in such difficult times. I compliment you on the magnificent success that Covenant House has enjoyed in the city.

Mr. LOKEN. Congresswoman, could I just say that without your support, Covenant House wouldn't exist in New Orleans. You are our mentor there and have really made the program happen. I think that your work there is an example of what one member of Government can do in a given situation to make it possible to work with kids. I am very grateful to you for everything you've done.

Mrs. BOGGS. Already, however, they need more rooms, more facilities. I thank you very much, and Father Ritter, everyone who is involved.

The real difficulties that all of you have addressed are all valid, all of your assumptions, obviously, are valid. You're all experts. You know what you're talking about. I have a feeling that we have imposed a certain time of life called adolescence on children that we didn't really differentiate so specifically in other times. I think that consumerism has a great deal to do with it. I agree about the lack of empowerment of the inner city neighborhoods where all these signs can go up and all these liquor stores can exist without any resistance from any of the city fathers or anyone else.

But children are impelled to look at television. They love television, it's exciting, it's all of the things that we all know is appealing to them. Unfortunately, everything on television, in between the violence of the programs, tells them to buy things, that they have to have all of these goods in order to be happy and to be successful and be admired by their peers. I do think values have to include some sense of value about physical goods and what they mean to life's happiness. I hope that we can address that as well.

I was wondering about the empowerment of the inner cities. You felt that we could have some legislative cures for it. Could you suggest what legislative cures we could use?

Dr. SPIVAK. I assume that there are others on the panel that have very strong feelings about this as well. I think the list is extremely long and ranges from communities having control over what is marketed and promoted in their neighborhoods to a considerable reassessment of the financial resources that we direct to various communities. I think that ranges from the kind of support we give poor families through the welfare system, and the kind of attitudes that are shown towards families in that system, to resources put into inner cities that attract business and jobs, and a sense of opportunity in those areas.

I think there is much to be done. I think that, except for some limited, targeted funding in some inner city areas in general, they have not received much attention. I think there are basic issues about people being able to keep their homes or their apartments, because as you put resources into an inner city, people with more money and more resources move in. What we are seeing in Boston—and I doubt this is unique—is that increasing pieces of what has been called the inner city are being gentrified and taken over and poor people are being pushed out of the city and into

small pockets, small city pockets, and even suburban pockets of poverty. So the geographic area gets fixed up but the people who live there do not benefit from that because they are kind of shoved out the back door as other people move in.

So I think there is a whole range of things, from housing and job opportunities to financial resources that need to be addressed. Schools. We have abandoned our inner city school systems. The Boston school system has been caught up in turmoil now for a decade and a half, and it is a disaster. There are no white children left in that school system. They have all left. They are not there. They are either going to religious schools or they are out of the city. Quite frankly, most any black family that has any financial resources sends their kids out of that system, too. We are not investing in these institutions and they are deteriorating.

Inner city schools are looking more and more like prisons. They do not have windows because nobody wants vandalism. They have graffiti all over their walls. They are disgusting. I'm not sure anyone in this room would be willing to send their children to that kind of setting, to send a 5-year-old into a building that looks like a bomb shelter. That is what is happening and these kids are learning from that.

Dr. BELL. In terms of empowerment, I work with some people in Chicago who again have been trying to set up a conflict resolution center in each of the large public housing developments. This is a grass roots effort. Because they have seen the OSAY program here in D.C., which appears to be working to some extent, where if there's a conflict between two families in the development, there's an elder person who comes and they sort of have court and resolve the conflict so that there is a way that violence doesn't get carried out.

It is kind of hard to think, if you're not resourced, what to do if you get into a conflict with somebody. Most of us hire lawyers and the battles are fought in court or fought on some nice turf. In the housing development, the fights are fought with fists and guns and knives. There is a Judge Cumerford who just refuses to allow the people in the housing developments in the City of Chicago to start these conflict resolution centers because he's afraid that somehow it is going to subvert the criminal justice system from dealing with the issues. But there have been a number of models that have been taken from other places which shows that this, in fact, works.

I think it would be appropriate to have people in those large—I guess they're horizontal reservations—to be able to mediate their own conflicts at a certain level and then, of course, if it gets past that level, to take it to a more legal and official means. But that would solve a lot of the mess. But those people are now being empowered. In fact, they're being blocked.

Mrs. BOGGS. Do you think that tenant management in public housing units would be a good suggestion?

Dr. BELL. I think that definitely would help. I'm a psychiatrist, and one of the things we learn in psychiatry is that if you have a group of people and you tell those people what to do, they don't take ownership of anything. They don't take ownership of behavior, don't take ownership of property, they don't take ownership of the milieu or the ward. But if you have a milieu president and you

have a milieu group and have a patient group, and those patients, for example, plan where they're going to go on their activity, they get involved, they get active, and they start developing psychosocial skills which allows them to plan and make very clear strategies around how to deal with issues. So through the process of involving people in their own destiny, they get on board and they take more responsibility for where they're headed.

Ms. MEIER. In East Harlem we're watching something interesting. The very success of the community in improving its conditions makes it more vulnerable to gentrification. There was opposition by a number of people in our community to our school. They said these schools will get a good reputation and it is going to increase the desirability of this neighborhood for middle class people because you will have a good school. The increased reputation of District 4 schools will make the neighborhood a target for gentrification. And it's true. I mean, I have an odd feeling that the people who have helped make our district a pilot district throughout the country educationally, in a sense are doing it, in the end, for other people's children.

We have a lot of contradictory policies. There is a good deal in the legislation re education which makes it more desirable to have big, highly centralized and bureaucratic schools: the nature of that legislation makes it very hard to have schools like ours.

This is not the time to go through a list of such things, but I think you have to keep an eye out for the difference between our rhetoric, which we all cite, and reality: rhetoric about small schools, in which the families and the teachers own the schools, rhetoric about teachers being empowered and parents being empowered, rhetoric about choice. That rhetoric is belied by the kinds of requirements that get embedded in Federal legislation for education, and the kind of interpretations that are made then by Federal agencies.

Mr. LOKEN. Could I just add one feature to this whole network. That is, the foster care system systematically takes children, at least in New York City, from one neighborhood and moves them to a far distant neighborhood and moves them again and again and again. So people in neighborhoods do not feel any ownership at all over the most vulnerable children in their midst. We have got to find a way in the foster care system of giving neighborhoods a sense of involvement in the children who grow up there, even the ones who need special intervention by the state.

At the present time, we are systematically cutting kids off from their mothers and their relatives by sending them to far distant parts of the city. It can take two hours for one of our young mothers at Covenant House to visit her child in foster care across the city. It is very hard to encourage her to keep visiting her child when she's got to spend two dangerous hours in the subway going and coming.

Mrs. BOGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank all of you.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you very much.

Let me just ask you, why do we have a problem now? I mean, several of you have testified that, in fact, things aren't terribly different today than they were two or three years ago. But now you have a political firestorm going on across the country. Obviously,

there's been some impact of the overlay of drugs and maybe automatic weapons that has raised the visibility. I mean, I have my theory on why we have a problem now, but I won't go into it for a minute.

Dr. BELL. The black psychiatrists of America started getting involved in this in 1976, because if you're in medical school and look at the statistics of what's killing people, it's apparent.

In 1980, the National Institute of Mental Health had a black homicide prevention conference. In 1984, they had another one. Jim Ralph, who was at NIMH, has been working on this. Finally, the Surgeon General came out and said violence is a public health issue. This was I don't know how many years ago.

I had a fascinating experience, because I had been to Washington, D.C. three times to talk with Reed Tuckson, the Commissioner of Health, about violence prevention. I talked and I gave him articles and 23 solutions and the whole bit. I found that people don't believe in me unless I've had my picture in the paper or been on television. So I draw a large media kind of presentation to get credibility.

Three weeks ago I was literally being begged to come back to Washington, D.C. I said well, I've been there a few times already and presented all my research, I presented all the solutions that I used that work, why do you want me back there now? What's so desperate? The guy said to me, when you were here before, violence was a public health issue. Now it's a political issue. You've got to come back now because we're the "murder capital".

I didn't come, because it's getting to be a political issue. That's the only thing that is, I think, starting to fuel the fires a little bit more.

Chairman MILLER. That's not a good sign, mind you. That's not an encouraging sign.

Dr. BELL. Tell me about it.

Chairman MILLER. This is my third war on drugs since I've been in Congress. We didn't win the first two. When things become a political issue, what we usually do is we authorize huge amounts of money we never appropriate and we go on to the next issue—sort of the "Andy Warhol" school of issues.

One of my concerns is—and I don't quite know how to phrase the question—but one of my concerns is that when you stand back and look at this, the statistics that bother us, the numbers of people getting killed and the state of some of these communities—and some of them are very small, some are right down the street here, in relatively small housing projects, or across the freeway, relatively small housing projects, almost in the shadow of the dome here—that you're really talking about the black community. In Los Angeles, you're talking about the Hispanic community; in Chicago you're talking about the Hispanic community. We're talking about a minority community.

As I have charted this issue, you have every white politician involved in Los Angeles when a young woman stepped outside of a restaurant in Westwood, L.A. and was shot by a stray bullet. People said, "Whoa, in Westwood?" Then you started having street sweeps and everything else. When we talked to the gangs about that, they said "We've got more money than the mayor does. We'll

outlast him. We know he's got a deficit." That comes from a 16 year old kid.

Then you get "wilding", which says to the white community, on a random basis, you could be a victim. Obviously, here the problem is the shadow of the Capitol dome. It looks like people like myself have no ability to run the Capitol City either on a home rule basis or on a Federal basis or what have you, and white politicians are embarrassed. But, other than that, I don't know the level of concern in the white community about what blacks are doing to blacks. I also don't know the level of concern in the black community about what blacks are doing to blacks, other than the potential of being a victim.

Dr. BELL. Again, the myths—I mean, I have been talking to black communities around the country, and their interests or their desires are misled. Again, a white policeman shoots a black kid—and I'm not suggesting that black folks shouldn't protest excessive police violence—but when that happens, you see a lot of energy. Then when you look at the family-friend homicides in that same black community, because the black community is not aware of what's going on because they read the newspapers—and if you believe what you read in the newspapers you must have a room temperature IQ—you believe that this is the rule instead of the exception to the rule. So your public policy gets directed by the exception to the rule.

Chairman MILLER. Most of the buildings here are air-conditioned. [Laughter.]

Dr. BELL. That makes it worse.

So there is a lack of information and a lack of direction.

When I was in Michigan, a white female psychiatrist came up to me and she said I'm afraid of you. I said what are you afraid about? She said, well, I'm afraid that if black people stop killing black people, they will start killing white people. She also reminded me that there were large numbers of white folks in this country—thank God, not all—who are quite happy that the homicide rates among blacks and Hispanics are as high as they are. So, as a result, if you look at state legislative initiatives around the suicide problem, which is three times more common in whites than in blacks, you see 18 states have rather large legislative initiatives. I don't know if they do anything with them.

Then if you look at the homicide legislation in those states, you only see two. I think that's Massachusetts, and, just recently, Ohio.

Chairman MILLER. I don't know that there is really a great deal of political interest in the white community and the black community in doing many of the things that you outlined this morning in terms of allocation of resources, whether that's for athletic equipment or public defenders or prosecutors. You can get there relatively easily in the notion of locking people up, but with everything else in between—whether it's the schools, the environment, runaway prevention, counseling or foster care—there is a separation going on here, I think, in society that suggests there is not a whole lot of political capital that's going to be spent designing those structures for prevention——

Ms. MEIER. Mr. Chairman, isn't it partly a question of leadership? I mean, people need to hear some ways in which you can ad-

dress it that is fair. There's a perception of unfairness, I think, from both sides. A lot of members of the white community think that it is unfair, whatever has happened is unfair, and it's aimed at them.

Chairman MILLER. There's no question about that.

Ms. MEIER. And the other way around, a large number of kids in our school perceive, just as he said, that solutions that are going to be arrived at are going to be unfair to their community and to them.

There has been absent in the last 20 years any national leadership to try to create a sense of real commitment to fairness, a real commitment to caring about the poor and the rich. We have had a glorification from the top down about you're a sucker to be poor and you're a sucker to be a "do-gooder" and a sucker to be a teacher, because there's big bucks out there to be made. We have gotten that from a lot of the leadership and from society.

I think there's a yearning, across racial lines and across economic lines, there is a sense of insecurity and anxiety and fear. People just don't know what kind of legislative and what kind of national policy could bring us together to begin to solve these fears. I think it's long-term visions. I know we have to do all these little things, but what is absent is a sense that those little things are part of a larger, long-range vision.

People would be more patient for long-range results, they would ask for less quick-fixes if they felt there was a longer range vision. There is an absence of the kind of vision that we're trying to offer our kids in our school. It doesn't resonate nationally. I think our kids suffer from the absence of a national resonance that crosses lines of race and class.

Judge WALTON. Mr. Chairman, I don't necessarily disagree with what you've indicated, but I do feel that we have to disavow the suggestion that this is only a black problem. I mean, clearly, it has it's most profound effect on the black community. But statistically, 75 to 80 percent of those individuals who are using drugs are not black. And while clearly the drug problem and other problems of crime are having their greatest impact on the black community, I don't think the white community can sit back with a sense of everything is all right, because I don't think that's the case.

I think that as long as we keep having the perception that this is only a black problem, I think it will continue to fester. So while I think there may be various reasons as to why there is the interest level that we have now, I think the level of interest that we have is good. I think we do have to do some things in order to turn around the situation we're now confronting.

Chairman MILLER. I don't disagree. I think this is our problem, because I think this one has the potential to lower the horizons of this country overall if you let it go unabated. But I don't see, within the political structure in this country, the willingness to bring a solution to match the problem. I guess that's what my concern is.

I have watched now two campaigns bring us two huge drug bills, on a bipartisan basis, with all of the speeches, and none of them have ever been fully funded and won't be according to all deliber-

ate plans over the next two, three or four year budgets. Yet we're in the middle of a crisis.

I see the suggestions now that we need $1.8 billion for a new crime bill announced yesterday, and it's going to come out of domestic discretionary programs, which are essentially the storefront programs that are trying to hold some of these communities together. And that was endorsed on a bipartisan basis. My concern is, you're right, this is our problem. But if the notion is somehow it's containable within the poor communities, and people are misled into believing that, one day they will find out that the "bear is at the door", so to speak, and that's what concerns me. What we see now are a lot of political responses by contrast to what this committee has spent a great deal of time looking at, and that is programs that work.

You have one in Chicago, one in Grand Rapids, and one in New Orleans, but you don't have any national programs. It depends on whether the community cared enough or had a donor or had somebody who was interested. It's catch as catch can. And yet we're talking about 20–30 million kids that are caught up in this spiral, in this environment. That's what I mean when I say I'm concerned about whether or not people view this as our problem, as America's problem.

Dr. BELL. I have to agree with you, because I have seen the exact same thing, which is why I have never asked for any money for anything that I do. I'm licensed in Illinois, I'm a physician, and therefore I can go around and start as many things as I want to, because I don't see the money coming. It is just not there.

But there is also a lack of synergy that occurs. I was in Louisville and I went to a conference. There were about 60 people that I heard talk. One guy had a conflict resolution program; another, a minister in a church, was starting a program. Another person was starting a black manhood ritual. They were all needing to be affiliated with one another in this little small city, and none of them knew each other. So what I have seen as I've gone around the country is that you have these little programs all over the place, but they are not dovetailed and intertwined with other synergistic programs, so that you have a holistic growth kind of a thing. If that could be encouraged and supported, which it is starting to with the focus on public health, then you're starting to see programs come together and find other things. But for me, it's a grass roots issue, because I don't see much support——

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I couldn't agree with the doctor more. I think one place that you do see groups coming together, if you would work with them, Doctor, is in congressional offices, in our home district offices. So often, when someone comes to me with a problem that they are trying to solve as a group, I know the other groups that are doing the same thing and put them in touch with each other.

For instance, a group of nuns started a place called Hope House, where they have nine different programs that they have coordinated under one administrative roof. They had an old convent and a place in which to hold meetings and to place the offices and so on, to distribute the food and clothing and whatever. I do think it's a source that you should investigate and encourage those of us in

Congress to be the kind of informational center. That could be helpful.

Dr. SPIVAK. Representative Miller, I would actually like to take issue with something that Dr. Bell said, and that is that I think there needs to be resources put in this direction. I think we can not accept the status quo in this. I think that some of the comments about leadership that have been made are very important. Somebody needs to get up and say that we do not have enough prisons and we will never have enough prisons if we do not put resources into stopping the flow of kids into the system, that we do not have enough police and will never have enough police if we do not stop the flow of kids into this process.

That is not an easy sale, and it is swimming against the tide. All of us do that every day. There needs to be a voice in Washington that does the same, because it really is going to get worse. We will be here ten years from talking about more money going into prisons and more money going into police and more money going into increasing the army of district attorneys that we have around this country, because it is not going to stop.

Chairman MILLER. In talking to the gangs and a number of young people at our hearings on gangs, when I left those hearings I just was struck by the fact that those people were telling the committee that they had made a fairly logical choice, given the alternatives in the community. That's not to justify their choice for gangs or anything of that sort. But when they talked about what was competing, the gang kind of looked like a place where you could find a lot of answers to some of your concerns, your inadequacies, or your feelings. This was a support system. It was also a violent system. But, in fact, it was kind of logical.

At one point one of the members talked about learning to say no, and the young man responded by "What do you want me to say yes to?" He described his community in terms of resources, where a 16-year-old young man growing up in that community, and essentially outlined there were none. There wasn't a boys club; there weren't even hoops.

The other thing they made very clear was that they felt the people who had gotten them into the drug trade were prepared to be in it for the long haul. These people were protecting a $100 billion market and they'll wait you out. That was his comment about the mayor. He said we can wait out the mayor. Mayor Bradley can't keep this up. They talked about a very complex structure of lease-back arrangements on corners so that the gangs who were being raided would have a place to do their weekend business.

They said the same thing in Chicago, and the police officer that was with one of them said the same thing. Mayor Washington, the mayor at that time is not going to have the resources to keep up this activity. It's going to go, it's going to be successful, and it's going to falter. Then the gangs will come back.

I guess I have a rhetorical question. The question now is, do we have a national will, the same national will that the gangs have, in terms of holding the market. You know, are we going to go into the market and compete like we do against Japanese automobiles or Venezuelan steel or whatever? Are we going to compete for our kids?

I'm not sure we are. I have seen no evidence that we are. We're not going to compete by putting turf on the fields or starting up a police athletic league or refurbishing the school, the boys club or the girls club. The question for us is, are we going to lose this by default? Are we going to lose a growing number of kids by default, in terms of the kind of long-term investment we would have to make to reclaim those kids, to stem that flow of kids, whether it's to foster care or to the juvenile justice system?

When I hear your thoughtful solutions, and I match that up against the willingness of the Congress or the President, I'm not sure that I haven't wasted your time, Dr. Bell, and others, because I'm not sure we can bring that match. We're still looking for a silver bullet.

Dr. BELL. In Richmond, VA I have seen a large number of community efforts coming together and coalesce, the church, the housing development office, the city manager, the police athletic league, the police department, businesses. So I see it happening. I don't see support necessarily, as you're saying, coming from up above. I didn't mean to say I don't need it. I do need it. But it has not been coming, and since it's not coming, I'm going to do what I have to do anyway.

But any support that can be given is always useful and helpful to support. Because there are efforts going on all over the country to deal with the problem, because some people can't escape and they've got to deal with it because it's on their back step every day.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you very much for your time and your testimony and help.

Ms. MEIER. Don't be too discouraged. We're here to hear your words, you know.

Chairman MILLER. I'm not. I just get angry and try to cover it up.

Ms. MEIER. We do need your leadership.

Chairman MILLER. We're in this for the long haul.

Ms. MEIER. There are some things out there that are encouraging.

Chairman MILLER. You kill six kids in a schoolyard or something and you draw politicians loose. I'm just trying to think how do you get it so that there is now enough evidence to say it's time for a national policy and time for leadership on this particular subject.

Mrs. Boggs.

Mrs. BOGGS. I just want to assure all of you that the Chairman is not going to give up.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you very, very much. We have some questions that Congressman Smith had that he wanted to submit in writing. He was unable to stay. We will send them to you.

Thank you.

Next we will hear from Jacqueline Simms, who is Captain and Acting Commander of the Youth Division for the Metropolitan Police Department; Dr. Delbert Elliott, who is a professor of sociology at the Institute of Behavioral Science at the University of Colorado; and Karl Zinsmeister, adjunct research associate, American Enterprise Institute here in Washington.

Welcome to the committee. We appreciate your taking the time to be here. Your written statement will be placed in the record and

you may proceed in the manner in which you're most comfortable. That includes if you want to make comments about what you heard while you were in the room in the exchange between Members and the previous panel.

Captain Simms, we will start with you. Thank you. I know we got you here on short notice, so I am especially appreciative that you were able to make the time available to us.

STATEMENT OF CAPT. JACQUELINE SIMMS, ACTING COMMANDER, YOUTH DIVISION, METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT, WASHINGTON, DC

Captain SIMMS. Good morning, Congressman Miller, and members of the congressional Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. I am Captain Jacqueline Simms of the Metropolitan Police Department's Youth Division, appearing on behalf of Chief of Police Maurice T. Turner, Jr., who unfortunately is unable to attend due to prior commitments. I am very pleased to have this opportunity to share in this discussion on youth-related crime, violence, and drugs.

From a statistical perspective, during the past several fiscal years our police department has experienced substantial increases in juvenile arrest levels. For example, in fiscal year 1986 there were 3,727 juvenile arrests; in fiscal year 1987, there were 5,387 juvenile arrests; and in fiscal year 1988, there were 6,499 juvenile arrests, of which 35 percent of those who want to court tested positive for illegal drug use.

In the past two years, juvenile arrests have dramatically increased at a rate of 74 percent. Within these statistics, the Department's juvenile drug arrests totals show comparable increases: in 1986 there were 1,222 arrests; in 1987, there were 1,442 drug arrests; and in 1988, there were 1,913 juvenile drug arrests. This drug arrest data reflects an increase of 56 percent. Compounding this problem is a juvenile recidivist rate which has averaged 60 percent over the past three years.

It is clear that we have a serious youth-crime problem in the District of Columbia. In response to this escalating problem, our Department has devoted more resources to the youth crime and drug problem. The Youth Division and Community Relations Division are focusing efforts to deter youth from crime and illicit drug activity.

In an effort to combat this emerging problem, greater emphasis is being placed on prevention and educational services. Specifically, we have implemented an early intervention program that is designed to identify at-risk youth before they become involved in the juvenile justice system. These young people, for select first offenses, are referred to the Department of Human Resources and the Metropolitan Police Boys and Girls Clubs. This intervention provides counseling and other youth services and assistance.

I believe that by making available this type of program to young people, we can begin to have an impact on the youth crime problem. We are aware that these youth often experience special problems, frequently drug related, which interfere with their educational progress. This is reflective in the high dropout rate, disruptive

behavior, and truancy. Too many youth are making the conscious choice to sell drugs for money and materialism while turning their backs on educational opportunities.

We must find solutions to this problem. We know that there are some very good programs that have been effective in addressing the drug issue in the area of prevention, education and treatment. Although these programs are often costly, experience has shown that every dollar spent on these extremely high-risk youth will save hundreds of dollars later in the treatment of criminal behavior and drug abuse.

A combined effort among the Department, the public school system and other agencies has prompted the establishment of a "drug free zone" policy around select city schools. In implementing this concept, the D.C. Public School system and the Metropolitan Police Department established a model drug prevention program referred to as Z-1000. This model program is designed to educate parents and students, identify high-risk youth, and divert them to the Department's early intervention program.

Through efforts of the police department and public schools, a 1,000 foot drug-free zone will be established. Signs will be posted and enforcement will be intensified around the targeted public schools. One of the aspects of this program will be to provide all school administrators, teachers, students and security personnel, local religious groups, social and business organizations with drug recognition training.

Five schools have been selected as prototypes in this initiative. The factors used in the selection of these sites include the number of homicides in the area, the number of open-air drug markets around the school, arrests in the vicinity of the school, crime in the surrounding area, and the frequency of calls for service in the area. The Youth Division will be responsible for all data collection associated with the program. Also, the career criminal unit will be monitoring the arrests and court intakes of all narcotic violators within 1,000 feet of D.C. public schools.

Chief Turner is of the opinion that we are in need of and has suggested that there be a 24-hour hotline for all parents so that they can be educated to the circumstances and identifiable characteristics of drug abuse. My experience is that many parents are often unaware of where to turn when they suspect their children of being involved with drugs. Parents, in their frustration and anxiety, often need as much help as the substance abuser. As a consequence, it is necessary that we establish support systems for them as well.

It is my opinion that we will have to continuously analyze data to address these problems and stay abreast of the constant changes occurring in the crime and drug cultures. But I am convinced that the long-term solution to our youth crime problem is in the area of strong family values and training, comprehensive education, prevention and treatment for youth before they become involved in delinquency and crime. More disconcerting is that we have made police far too often the institution of first response, rather than of last resort, in addressing problems with our children. We use police to maintain order in the schools, to address problems of truancy

and, most recently, through legislation, we are trying to use police to keep children in their homes and not on the streets.

Collectively, we can make a difference. We have to enlist more churches, more private-sector organizations, more agencies and more businesses in helping to solve youth problems. We also have to make the growth and development of young people a priority of this Nation. We are all guilty, to some degree, of failure, both at the Federal Government and local government levels. There is no need to point fingers or make accusations. How will we face the complex challenges of the future if we have a generation of young people crippled by drugs?

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Captain Jacqueline Simms follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CAPT. JACQUELINE SIMMS, METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT'S YOUTH DIVISION, WASHINGTON, DC

GOOD MORNING CONGRESSMAN MILLER AND MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES. I AM CAPTAIN JACQUELINE SIMMS OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT'S YOUTH DIVISION, APPEARING ON BEHALF OF CHIEF OF POLICE MAURICE T. TURNER, JR., WHO UNFORTUNATELY IS UNABLE TO ATTEND DUE TO PRIOR COMMITMENTS. I AM VERY PLEASED TO HAVE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO SHARE IN THIS DISCUSSION ON YOUTH-RELATED CRIME, VIOLENCE, AND DRUGS.

FROM A STATISTICAL PERSPECTIVE, DURING THE PAST SEVERAL FISCAL YEARS, OUR POLICE DEPARTMENT HAS EXPERIENCED SUBSTANTIAL INCREASES IN JUVENILE-ARREST LEVELS. FOR EXAMPLE, IN FY 1986, THERE WERE 3,727 JUVENILE ARRESTS; IN FY 1987 THERE WERE 5,387 JUVENILE ARRESTS; AND IN FY 1988 THERE WERE 6,499 JUVENILE ARRESTS, OF WHICH, 35 PERCENT OF THOSE WHO WENT TO COURT TESTED POSITIVE FOR ILLEGAL DRUG USE. IN THE PAST TWO YEARS, JUVENILE ARRESTS HAVE DRAMATICALLY INCREASED AT A RATE OF 74 PERCENT. WITHIN THESE STATISTICS THE DEPARTMENT'S JUVENILE DRUG ARRESTS TOTALS SHOW COMPARABLE INCREASES: IN 1986 THERE WERE 1,222 ARRESTS; IN 1987 THERE WERE 1,442 DRUG ARRESTS AND IN 1988, THERE WERE 1,913 JUVENILE DRUG ARRESTS. THIS DRUG ARREST DATA REFLECTS AN INCREASE OF 56 PERCENT. COMPOUNDING THIS PROBLEM IS A JUVENILE RECIDIVIST RATE WHICH HAS AVERAGED 60 PERCENT OVER THE PAST 3 YEARS.

IT IS CLEAR THAT WE HAVE A SERIOUS YOUTH-CRIME PROBLEM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA. IN RESPONSE TO THIS ESCALATING PROBLEM, OUR DEPARTMENT HAS DEVOTED MORE RESOURCES TO THE YOUTH CRIME AND DRUG PROBLEM. THE YOUTH DIVISION AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS DIVISION ARE FOCUSING EFFORTS TO DETER YOUTH FROM CRIME AND ILLICIT DRUG ACTIVITY.

IN AN EFFORT TO COMBAT THIS EMERGING PROBLEM, GREATER EMPHASIS IS BEING PLACED ON PREVENTION AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES. SPECIFICALLY, WE HAVE IMPLEMENTED AN EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAM THAT IS DESIGNED TO IDENTIFY AT RISK YOUTH BEFORE THEY BECOME INVOLVED IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM. THESE YOUNG PEOPLE, FOR SELECT FIRST OFFENSES, ARE REFERRED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES AND THE METROPOLITAN POLICE BOYS AND GIRLS CLUBS. THIS INTERVENTION PROVIDES COUNSELING AND OTHER YOUTH SERVICES AND ASSISTANCE.

I BELIEVE THAT BY MAKING AVAILABLE THIS TYPE OF PROGRAM TO YOUNG PEOPLE WE CAN BEGIN TO HAVE AN IMPACT ON THE YOUTH-CRIME PROBLEM. WE ARE AWARE THAT THESE YOUTH OFTEN EXPERIENCE SPECIAL PROBLEMS, FREQUENTLY DRUG-RELATED, WHICH INTERFERE WITH THEIR EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS. THIS IS REFLECTIVE IN THE HIGH DROPOUT RATE, DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR AND TRUANCY. TOO MANY YOUTH ARE MAKING THE CONSCIOUS CHOICE TO SELL DRUGS FOR MONEY AND MATERIALISM WHILE TURNING THEIR BACKS ON EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES. WE MUST FIND SOLUTIONS TO THIS PROBLEM. WE KNOW THAT THERE ARE SOME VERY GOOD

PROGRAMS THAT HAVE BEEN EFFECTIVE IN ADDRESSING THIS DRUG ISSUE IN THE AREA OF PREVENTION, EDUCATION, AND TREATMENT. ALTHOUGH THESE PROGRAMS ARE OFTEN COSTLY, EXPERIENCE HAS SHOWN THAT EVERY DOLLAR SPENT ON THESE EXTREMELY HIGH-RISK YOUTH WILL SAVE HUNDREDS OF DOLLARS LATER IN THE TREATMENT OF CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR AND DRUG ABUSE.

A COMBINED EFFORT AMONG THE DEPARTMENT, PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM, AND OTHER AGENCIES HAS PROMPTED THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A "DRUG-FREE ZONE" POLICY AROUND SELECT CITY SCHOOLS. IN IMPLEMENTING THIS CONCEPT, THE D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM AND THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT ESTABLISHED A MODEL DRUG PREVENTION PROGRAM REFERRED TO AS "Z-1000". THIS MODEL PROGRAM IS DESIGNED TO EDUCATE PARENTS AND STUDENTS, IDENTIFY HIGH RISK YOUTHS, AND DIVERT THEM TO THE DEPARTMENT'S EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAM.

THROUGH EFFORTS OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS, A 1,000 FOOT DRUG-FREE ZONE WILL BE ESTABLISHED, OFFICIALLY POSTED AND ENFORCED AROUND THE TARGETED PUBLIC SCHOOLS. ONE OF THE ASPECTS OF THIS PROGRAM WILL BE TO PROVIDE ALL SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS, STUDENTS AND SECURITY PERSONNEL; LOCAL RELIGIOUS GROUPS; SOCIAL AND BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS WITH DRUG RECOGNITION TRAINING.

FIVE (5) SCHOOLS HAVE BEEN SELECTED AS PROTOTYPES IN THIS INITIATIVE. THE FACTORS USED IN THE SELECTION OF THESE SITES

INCLUDE: 1) THE NUMBER OF HOMICIDES IN THE AREA; 2) THE NUMBER OF OPEN-AIR DRUG MARKETS AROUND THE SCHOOL; 3) ARRESTS IN THE VICINITY OF THE SCHOOL; 4) CRIME IN THE SURROUNDING AREA; AND 5) THE FREQUENCY OF CALLS FOR SERVICE IN THE AREA. THE YOUTH DIVISION WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL DATA COLLECTION ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROGRAM. ALSO, THE CAREER CRIMINAL UNIT WILL BE MONITORING THE ARRESTS AND COURT (FEDERAL AND LOCAL) INTAKES OF ALL NARCOTIC VIOLATORS MADE WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

CHIEF TURNER IS OF THE OPINION THAT WE ARE IN NEED OF AND HAS SUGGESTED THAT THERE BE A 24-HOUR HOTLINE FOR ALL PARENTS, SO THAT THEY CAN BE EDUCATED TO THE CIRCUMSTANCES AND IDENTIFIABLE CHARACTERISTICS OF DRUG ABUSE. MY EXPERIENCE IS THAT MANY PARENTS ARE OFTEN UNAWARE OF WHERE TO TURN WHEN THEY SUSPECT THEIR CHILDREN OF BEING INVOLVED WITH DRUGS. PARENTS, IN THEIR FRUSTRATION AND ANXIETY, OFTEN NEED AS MUCH HELP AS THE SUBSTANCE ABUSER. AS A CONSEQUENCE, IT IS NECESSARY THAT WE ESTABLISH SUPPORT SYSTEMS FOR THEM AS WELL.

IT IS MY OPINION THAT WE WILL HAVE TO CONTINUOUSLY ANALYZE DATA TO ADDRESS THESE PROBLEMS AND STAY ABREAST OF THE CONSTANT CHANGES OCCURRING IN THE CRIME AND DRUG CULTURES. BUT I AM CONVINCED THAT THE LONG-TERM SOLUTION TO OUR YOUTH-CRIME PROBLEMS IS IN THE AREA OF STRONG FAMILY VALUES AND TRAINING, COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION, PREVENTION AND TREATMENT FOR YOUTH

INTENTIONAL BLANK

BEFORE THEY BECOME INVOLVED IN DELINQUENCY AND CRIME. MORE DISCONCERTING IS THAT WE HAVE MADE POLICE, FAR TOO OFTEN, THE INSTITUTION OF FIRST RESPONSE, RATHER THAN OF LAST RESORT IN ADDRESSING PROBLEMS WITH OUR CHILDREN. WE USE POLICE TO MAINTAIN ORDER IN THE SCHOOLS, TO ADDRESS PROBLEMS OF TRUANCY AND MOST RECENTLY, THROUGH LEGISLATION, WE ARE TRYING TO USE POLICE TO KEEP CHILDREN IN THEIR HOMES AND NOT ON THE STREETS.

COLLECTIVELY, WE CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE. WE HAVE TO ENLIST MORE CHURCHES, MORE PRIVATE-SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS, MORE AGENCIES AND MORE BUSINESSES IN HELPING TO SOLVE YOUTH PROBLEMS. WE ALSO HAVE TO MAKE THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF YOUNG PEOPLE A PRIORITY OF THIS NATION. WE ARE ALL GUILTY, TO SOME DEGREE, OF FAILURE, BOTH AT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT LEVELS. THERE IS NO NEED TO POINT FINGERS OR MAKE ACCUSATIONS. HOW WILL WE FACE THE COMPLEX CHALLENGES OF THE FUTURE IF WE HAVE A GENERATION OF YOUNG PEOPLE CRIPPLED BY DRUGS?

THANK YOU.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you.
Dr. Elliott.

STATEMENT OF DELBERT S. ELLIOTT, Ph.D., PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY, INSTITUTE OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, BOULDER, CO

Dr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, let me just highlight a few things that are presented in the formal written comments.

One of the concerns that was clearly expressed earlier had to do with whether or not we really have witnessed an increase in the levels of violence. The statistics are clear. Certainly we're seeing more arrests for violent behavior; we're seeing more persons penetrate the justice system for violent behavior. But the issue I think, in a number of ways has to do with whether we are seeing an increase in the proportion of the adolescent population who are becoming involved in violence or whether we are simply seeing a change in the levels of violence on the part of those few who are engaging in violence. The evidence from a number of sources suggests that, in fact, it is the latter which we are seeing.

The proportion of adolescents in the United States who are becoming involved in violent behavior is not increasing—at least the evidence suggests that's the case. If anything, the evidence suggests that that proportion is decreasing.

We see that from a number of different perspectives. We see that in the two annual surveys on family violence, which showed a fairly dramatic decrease in the levels of family violence in the two surveys over a 10-year period. We see it in the National Youth Survey, you see it for drugs in the Monitoring the Future Studies, which report a declining proportion involved in all forms of drugs, with the exception of alcohol, since 1980. So the proportion who are involved is declining. That's the good news.

The bad news is that those persons who are involved in violent behavior, who are using drugs, who are involved in delinquency, are committing offenses at a much higher rate.

Secondly, the use of weapons has aggravated the situation as compared to ten years ago. So we are seeing much higher levels of injury, we are seeing much higher levels of homicides, and that's a real fact. But it has to do with a change in the levels of individual offending which characterize those who are actively involved.

A number of people ask what's different today, what is different today as compared to ten years ago, and why has this become a critical issue. I think it has to do with three factors: one is the presence of weapons; two is the presence of drugs and the effect of drugs on criminal careers; and three, we are witnessing an increasing level of isolation in our urban communities which has perpetuated adolescence for many young men in particular. Rather than making the transition out of adolescence at 18 or 19, is transition is not being made in many communities, particularly those areas which are described as concentrated areas of poverty where the opportunity for work and employment is extremely limited. What we are seeing now is age-integrated gangs in those communities because young men, 24, 25, 26 are not working and they are still in

many respects caught up in the adolescent phase of their development.

To offer a little insight into violence, we looked at the developmental progression into violence in the representative sample of youth participating in the National Youth Survey. I want to describe that developmental sequence for you very briefly. We have been following this representative sample of adolescents over 12 years now, tracking their developmental progression and documenting the different life courses and life paths that are involved, and which paths put individuals at high risk for violence and for serious sustained involvement in drugs.

First, there are some interesting differences with respect to the timing of events across these different life paths. Approximately 15 percent of our sample—that's a relatively large number—were classified as serious violent offenders at some time during the ten-year period that we've been following them. This is between 1976 and 1986. For virtually all of those persons, the onset of violence took place very early, before mid-adolescence or in mid-adolescence. As a matter of fact, 25 percent of those persons had the onset of serious violence by the age of 11. They're not likely to be arrested, they're not likely to appear in our criminal justice statistics, but by their own self-reported involvement, they were engaged in serious violent behavior. They were simply not old enough to produce the same kind of damage that they would if they were 18 or 19, and they typically did not have access to weapons.

Nearly 70 percent of those who are violent terminate their career by the age of 18, so that violence is uniquely an adolescent phenomenon. It begins in early adolescence, it peaks at 15 or 16, and for the most part it's over by the age of 18 or 19. The hazard rate, meaning the probability for onset of violence, after the age of 20 is essentially zero.

The problem is that we are seeing today a carryover from adolescent violence into adulthood, so a larger percentage are continuing their careers into the adult period. Approximately 20 percent of those for whom the onset of violence takes place in their adolescent years continue that violent behavior on into adulthood. What we are seeing is not only higher rates of offending upon the part of individual offenders, but longer offending careers. Those persons who are delinquent, who are engaging in violent behavior, continue to engage in violent behavior over a longer period of time and at a higher frequency. That is what's producing the higher rates of arrest.

A comment about illicit drug use. Illicit drug use is late in the developmental progression. It clearly cannot be viewed as a cause for the onset of violent behavior. Violent behavior almost always precedes it. What the evidence does show, however, is that the use of drugs prolongs the career. It serves to maintain levels of violence. Even though it's not implicated in the cause, it clearly is implicated in the maintenance of violence. So the access to weapons, the longer period of adolescence which we are viewing today because of the increased isolation which is experienced by many in areas of concentrated poverty, and the presence of drugs, all serve to make careers longer and rates of offending higher.

Let me turn then to the question of the antecedents or the risk factors involved. Here again we talking about a sample, which is a representative sample of American adolescents, not just those who penetrate the justice system.

Clearly, the early roots of violence go back to the family breakdown and to the kinds of disorganization which characterizes many neighborhoods. I would like to highlight the more proximate causes of violence, however. You have heard a lot about those causes. But what are the most immediate causes of violence during adolescence—that is, what are the immediate precipitating factors.

What we know is that during early childhood, failure and home/family breakdown, poor performance in school, limited levels of bonding to the school, and the failure to internalize norms and values put youth at risk for violence. While these may be the initial causal effects, they are almost all mediated during adolescence by the kind of peer group that an individual chooses. The kinds of friends that an individual chooses to associate with generally reflect those early experiences, the levels of bonding, the belief structures that an individual has.

The peer group then comes to be the mediating factor. During adolescence, the influence of parents, and even the influence of schools, give way to an influence in the immediate peer group. That peer group becomes the dominant support structure for adolescents from the ages of 14, when they enter middle school or junior high school, through graduation from high school. During that period, the peer group is the dominant support structure for kids. This is not to deny that parents are still there, but with respect to patterns of behavior, with respect to the use of violence, with respect to drug use, with respect to a wide range of problem behaviors, it is the peer group which is the critical social context reinforcing these behaviors.

Those individuals who are in delinquent peer groups, particularly those kinds of peer groups which have age-graded models for committing delinquent acts, where they learn techniques of moral disengagement which provides justification and rationalizations for engaging in crime at that particular point in time, those peer groups become the dominant source for the learning and the performance of violent behavior.

These groups typically involve kids who are overbonded to their peers. By overbonded, what I mean is that they have very little attachment to conventional others, little attachment to family, little attachment to school, no adult mentors. So they have invested their total emotional, psychological and social support in their peers.

When that happens, some very unfortunate things happen. You get kinds of behavior taking place in a group setting that you would not see take place outside of that setting. Violence is not just an individual act. Violence is an expression of group hostility, of group alienation, a feeling of "us versus them" which grows out of that attachment into those primary social groups.

Any attempt to deal with violent behavior on the part of adolescents which ignores the peer groups to which they belong is bound to be unsuccessful. For the most part, we've ignored them. We have very few targeted interventions aimed directly at the peer group.

In the Sixties we had some gang-oriented kinds of approaches, some detached worker programs and other kinds of programs. They were in some cases successful and in other cases not successful. I'm not just talking here about the formal organized gangs with colors and names, et cetera. I'm talking about a peer group which in many cases is much less formal than that. But the fact of the matter is, the peer group must be addressed in any attempt to deal with problems of violence.

I make some recommendations at the end of my written comments which focus primarily upon those kinds of things—that is, if we attempt to intervene with parents when a child is 15 or 16, that parent has very little influence over the child's behavior which is not already expressed in the earlier kinds of socialization processes. It is a misguided effort to think about family/parent training programs for 15 year old kids who are immersed in adolescent peer groups.

By the same token, much of what we do in treatment has the unfortunate, inadvertent effect of generating cohesion to delinquent peer groups. We put them together in group counseling sessions. We bring them together in institutions in which they learn from one another. They go through "combat" together in treatment and that produces a kind of bonding to one another which carries over outside of the institution when they leave and tends to make individuals more committed to deviance and violence rather than less.

The problem is a difficult one, and there aren't many programs that I could mention to you that are trying to deal with the peer group. There are a couple. One I know of in St. Louis, which attempted to take kids who were involved in serious delinquent behavior and integrate them into prosocial groups which were organized around athletic teams. That program worked fairly well. The kids would get involved with a set of prosocial peers and, if bonding took place—and in some instances it did not—if it took place, typically there was a marked change in the behavior of those kids because it was now not normative for them to engage in those kinds of behaviors.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Delbert S. Elliott, Ph.D., follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DELBERT S. ELLIOTT, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, BOULDER, CO

Introduction. The recent events in Central Park involving a brutal assault and gang rape of a woman jogger by members of a young adolescent gang highlight the dramatic increase in adolescent violence over the last 10 years which has been documented by criminologist and law enforcement agencies. Not only has this trend been observed in official police data, but it is also observed in studies which rely upon youth's self-reports of their own involvement in delinquent behavior and substance use. I assume the committee is aware of the magnitude of this problem and I will not attempt to document it further here.

It is not clear, however, whether this increase in the rate at which violent offenses occur in the adolescent population is a result of an increase in the proportion of adolescents who commit violent crimes or in the frequency at which violent offenses are committed by those youth who are active violent offenders in any year (or some combination of these two types of change). This is an important issue which has direct implications for how we should approach this problem. Although the data appropriate to this question are limited, the available evidence suggests the latter is the case, i.e., the major part of the observed increase in adolescent violence is the result of higher individual offending rates on the part of those relatively few youth who commit violent offenses; while there may be slight increases in the proportion of youth involved in violent behavior, this does not appear to be the primary explanation for the increased rate of violent offending. This is an issue I will return to later.

Particulary alarming is the number of homicides and aggravated assaults with serious injury involving adolescent offenders and victims. While the proportion of adolescents involved in violent acts may not be any higher than in earlier years, we are witnessing a level of violence on the part adolescent offenders which is far more serious. What is different today as compared with 10 years ago is the extent to which weapons are implicated in assaults by adolescents.

Developmental Progression into Violence. For the past 15 years my colleagues and I at the University of Colorado have been directing a study of a representative sample of American youth

who were aged 11-17 in 1976, following these youth over time, examining the different life-trajectories in this sample, and how particular life paths put youth at particularly high or low risk for crime, violence and substance use/abuse (funded by the Antisocial and Violent Behavior Branch, NIMH, with supplemental funding from OJJDP and NIJ, Department of Justice). The following observations about the antecedents of adolescent violence focus upon risk factors that are present or emerge during adolescence age 11-21). I am thus focusing upon the more proximate causes and risk factors for crime, violence and substance use/abuse.

Let me make several descriptive observations about the timing and developmental progression of serious violent behavior in this representative national sample. Approximately 15 percent were classified as serious violent offenders (aggravated assaults, robberies, sexual assaults or gang fights) for one or more years between 1976 and 1984. For virtually all of these persons, the onset of violence took place in early to mid-adolescence, only one percent initiated violence after age 18. Nearly 70 percent terminated their violent offending prior to age 18, and the average career length was 2.3 years. The typical progression in problem behavior begins with minor forms of delinquency, then initiation of alcohol use, initiation of marijuana use, escalation into more serious delinquency (including violence) and then to multiple illicit drug use. Illicit drugs (other than marijuana) is not typically an antecedent to serious violent behavior. Our data show that the onset of illicit drugs are causally implicated in the maintenance of violence, i.e., they lead to longer careers and higher rates of violence on the part of those using illicit drugs, but they are not implicated in the onset of serious violence. There is no evidence for a systematic effect of using drugs on violent acts, i.e., that those under the influence of illicit drugs are any more or less likely to commit a violent act. This is not to deny that some persons under the influence of drugs commit violent acts, but it is to note that as many others are less likely or equally likely to do so. In general, those who are violent under the influence of drugs are also violent when not under the influence of drugs. Violence is a pre-condition. There is more support for the direct effect of alcohol on violence than for illicit drugs. There is also a strong connection between selling drugs and violence, but violence again appears to be a selection factor rather than an effect. Developmentally then, violence begins in early-to-mid adolescence, lasts for several years, is extended over the lifecourse and exacerbated by alcohol and drug use, and is typically terminated by age 18 (although longer for those involved in polydrug use/abuse).

Antecedents and Risk Factors. The primary risk factors for those who became involved in serious violence involved low levels of bonding to the family and weak ties to the school (or any other conventional group or institution), a set of personal beliefs

which tolerated deviant behavior generally and which justified crime and violence as appropriate behavior under a wide range of perceived "mitigating circumstances", and involvement in peer groups where these behaviors were modelled and encouraged. Developmentally, weak ties to the family, poor integration and performance at school, and weak internal controls on behavior (beliefs and values) lead to the selection of particular types of peer groups. Those youth with strong bonds to family and school typically choose prosocial youth as friends whereas those with weak bonds to family and school choose other alienated and delinquent youth as friends. The strongest predictor of delinquent behavior, violence and drug use, is thus the type of peer group in which the youth becomes involved. The causal influence of early parent training and bonding, and school bonding and beliefs, is thus channeled largely through the type of friends chosen during early adolescence. In the absence of delinquent peers, there is little risk for any serious violent behavior, and virtually no risk for any sustained involvement in serious violent behavior. Those at highest risk for violent behavior are thus youth who are overbonded to their peer group, those who have essentially no bonds to any other persons, groups or institutions, who are isolated from conventional society and who are almost entirely dependent upon the peer group for emotional and social support and where this group is highly tolerant of or even encourages deviant forms of behavior. While formal gangs (one form of delinquent peer group) are most likely to emerge in disorganized neighborhoods, more informal delinquent peer groups can be found in most school settings and are facilitated by the way we structure our educational programs (putting all "problem youth" into the same academic track and grouping them in the same classes for better control and management).

Implications for Interventions. First, the evidence suggests that the current escalation in adolescent violence is most likely a result of increasing individual offending rates, longer careers and increasing levels of injury (weapons use) on the part of a relatively constant proportion of active offenders, not an increase in the proportion of youth involved in serious violence. The change in violence does not appear to reflect an increased vulnerability to the basic antecedents of violence which lead to increasing proportions of the population becoming involved in serious violence. Rather, it may be attributed to two primary factors: the maintenance effects of drug use and drug selling and the ready access to guns and other high-tech weapons. The most obvious and dramatic reduction in violence is linked to changing these two conditions. Gun control alone would produce a dramatic reduction in the number and seriousness of violent incidents on the part of adolescents.

Second, adolescent violence does not take place in a social vacuum, nor is it a purely individual phenomenon. This behavior

is rationalized, supported and rewarded by the individual's immediate social network. Given the critical role of the adolescent peer group in the onset and maintenance of violent behavior, several things follow: 1) once youth are in mid-adolescence, attempts to intervene with parents, to provide parent effectiveness training, to improve school performance and otherwise strengthen school and family bonds, are not likely to be successful unless there are simultaneous changes in the youth's peer group involvement; 2) the peer group should be targeted as a primary intervention point; 3) Existing delinquency prevention programs should be examined to make sure that they are not inadvertently facilitating the formation and increasing cohesion of delinquent peer groups. This is clearly one of the by-products of our treatment facilities--state training schools and even community group homes may operate to facilitate delinquent peer groups. Likewise, tracking and particular strategies for grouping students in our schools also facilitate the formation of delinquent peer groups. It should also be noted that youth can overcome or compensate for childhood deficiencies in socialization and control by establishing bonds to conventional institutions and persons, e.g., school, teachers, other positive adult role models, and prosocial peers during adolescence. A focus upon building conventional support structures during adolescence may be the most important strategy for dealing with the most proximate causes of adolescent violence.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you.
Mr. Zinsmeister.

STATEMENT OF KARL ZINSMEISTER, ADJUNCT RESEARCH ASSOCIATE, AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. ZINSMEISTER. Thank you, Chairman Miller.

I also have submitted formal testimony. I'm just going to skip through it here.

People have asked about the extensiveness of violence. I would like to cite one study that I think sheds some light on that. It was recently completed by researchers at the University of Maryland School of Medicine in Baltimore. It helps, I think, shed some light on precisely the extent of this trauma.

They had a sample of 167 teenagers who visited a city center clinic for routine medical care. They surveyed that group as to their exposure to various incidents of violence. The results, I think, were fairly stunning. Twenty-four percent of these teenagers had witnessed a murder. Seventy-two percent knew someone who had been shot. These teenagers had witnessed an average of more than five criminal episodes each, and they knew nearly 12 persons who had been crime victims. Twenty-three percent of them had themselves had their lives threatened, and nine percent had been raped.

So today we have earnest people asking how this problem snuck up on us and what its sources might be. Frankly, I really don't understand the surprise. The evidence has been there for a long time.

I am currently writing a book on sort of generally the status of American children. You really don't have to look very far to see the problems. I sort of skipped through some of these in my testimony. Illegitimacy, roughly one out of four children are now born without benefit of married parents. Divorce and abandonment of children by their fathers is about double the normal post-war level. There are something like 1.5 million children age 12 to 17 that have tried crack or cocaine. You know, we have let the idea that every individual should try to be self-supporting slip away. I think 40 percent of inner city men age 18 to 21 have not worked a single day on the last year.

Public housing has become a hellish place to grow up, and not accidently. Twenty years ago there were lots of good public housing complexes. There are very few today. One of the reasons is because it takes eight to ten months to evict someone from a public housing project in a major city today.

Effective discipline in the schools has vanished in many cases. Something like one in twenty teachers are physically assaulted every year, and one-quarter of all school principles report that student possession of weapons is a problem. So when you look at some of these things, again, it is hard to be surprised that we're beginning to reap a very bitter harvest.

I just want to reiterate what some of the other witnesses have already said, that clearly, the most important root of all is family breakdown. Sixty percent of all children born today are going to spend at least part of their growing up period in a single parent

household. You know, there is a huge debate as to what the causes of that are, which we don't have time to get into here.

I think the significant fact is that today a wide range of people, on the right, left and center, agree that family structure is now the principal conduit of class structure, and the principal predictor of social problems. Again, this isn't personal or prejudice. There is the verdict of large literature.

Let me quote from a study put out by the National Association of Elementary School Principals. "One-parent children, on the whole, show lower achievement in school than their two-parent peers. Among all two-parent children, 30 percent were ranked as high achievers, compared to only one percent of one-parent children. At the other end of the scale, only two percent of two-parent children were low achievers, while fully 40 percent of the one-parent children fell in that category.

"There are more clinic visits by one-parent students. And their absence rate runs far higher than for students with two parents, and one-parent students lose about eight days more over the course of the year.

One-parent students are consistently more likely to be late, to be truant, and to be subject to disciplinary action by every criterion we examined at both the elementary and the secondary school levels, and so forth.

Again, just to return to some of the evidence, the Bureau of Justice Statistics reported recently that 70 percent of the juveniles in State reform institutions today grew up in either single-parent or no-parent homes. Most street gang members have been shown to come from broken homes, and one recent study of 72 adolescent murderers found that three-quarters of them came from nonintact families.

Now, again, none of this, I think, should surprise us. It was almost a quarter-century ago that Daniel Patrick Moynihan wrote:

> From the wild Irish slums of the nineteenth century eastern seaboard to the riot-torn suburbs of Los Angeles, there is one unmistakable lesson in American history. A community that allows a large number of young men and women to grow up in broken families, dominated by women, never acquiring any stable relationships to male authority, never acquiring any set of rational expectations about the future, that community asks for and gets chaos.

But despite the fact that, as I say, there is this fairly broad consensus that this is the real root of the problem, unfortunately, American public policy has shied from the idea that certain family forms are more socially desirable than others. In my opinion, a foolish neutrality has worked its way into our laws, suggesting, in the face of contrary evidence, that, from the point of view of larger social functioning, any one family form is as good as the next.

The end result of our failure to defend nuclear families and build them up and to positively support and reinforce them is that a very significant minority of American children are now growing up in the midst of this appalling disorder. Again, the people who are really hurt—rich people can afford splintered families; there might be a lot of heartache involved, but they are probably not going to be incapacitated. But when you are talking about poor people, people that are ill educated, people that are historically discrimi-

nated against, if you take them out of the safe harbor of family solidarity, they have very little to fall back on.

So I think this has been extremely shortsighted, this kind of squeamishness on the part of public policy about saying out and out, without reservation, that the desired locus of child rearing at least ought to be an intact family and we are willing to put our money where our mouth is.

So I think this is, as far as sources, the real nut of the problem, and some of the effects, I think, have become increasingly troubling, never mind this latest Central Park case. There was an earlier case in Washington, which I am sure many of you remember, where a group of youths robbed, gang-raped, and murdered a 99-pound middle-aged mother while singing and joking. In another recent case, a 17-year-old shot a taxi driver in the head because he "wanted to try out a gun." In another one recently taking place, two teenagers killed another youth because they wanted his "boom box" radio. There are a whole host of disturbing cases like this across the country.

This brings us, I think, to an important point. Clearly, the origins and the influences of childhood disturbance are of interest to public policy makers; they are certainly of interest to me. If we can identify those children who are threatened by the turmoil swirling around them, maybe we can reduce some of that turmoil.

But I would also suggest very strongly that once a particular juvenile has, himself, committed a serious crime, the why's and the "how comes" have to become a secondary issue. At that point, justice must be pursued for the sake for the aggrieved and to maintain the essential proposition that crime brings on punishment.

Very often, I think, we become paralyzed trying to decide whether a juvenile criminal is a victim or a victimizer, and that can lead to very dangerous territory. As an example, let me say that the last D.C. policeman, to my knowledge, to be killed in the line of duty was shot by a 17-year-old in the process of burgling a clothing store while he was on PCP. This individual's criminal record began at age 10 when he was charged with sexually assaulting a 5-year-old. In subsequent years, he was arrested for robbery/force and violence; then grand larceny; assault with intent to rob; obstruction of justice, and second degree burglary; then robbery/force and violence, and assault with intent to rob; later, second degree burglary; and then, one year before shooting the police officer, with assault with a deadly weapon.

Maybe once, maybe twice, you could say let's err on the side of leniency, but in this kind of case, which is very, very common, in failing to punish the offenses as the serious crimes they were, first of all, you send a terrible message to the individual involved; second of all, you extend a tragic trail of heartache a lot further than it had to extend.

Let me also say that this is not a moot issue. We are at a particularly risky moment to indulge juvenile lawlessness right now. I have just been examining some of the figures. In just the last few years, in several major American cities, the number of juveniles arrested for drug distribution—selling drugs—exceeded the number arrested for drug possession, the more sort of passive act of, using and having drugs, for the first time ever. That is very significant.

In other words, in my view, a lost generation has just graduated from victim to victimizer, and if we have any hope of preventing them from infecting a class of successors and from stalking an innocent public, then I think we have to see with clear eyes what they have become, which is very sad cases who are now unambiguously part of the problem. Unless this current crop of teenage marauders is incapacitated, I fear we are going to institutionalize the vicious cycle of youths preyed upon and then preying upon others.

Let me skip through some of my solutions here. I really don't have time to present them in any detail. Basically, I suggest we need, first of all, some positive family building acts. I am not at all opposed to these store-front organizations or the boys' clubs, that stuff is great, but they are band-aids. The real action, if you want to create some long-term positive influences, is to try to heal American families, and, again, I'm not one of those who believes that that is just a fact of life, something we have to throw up our hands and accept. I think we can change family structure if we are willing to try. So we need some positive family building measures.

We need also some negative sanctions, some new penalties, I think, against people who prey on children. For instance, very briefly, we are now experiencing an absolute epidemic around this country of children born physically damaged and addicted to drugs, a tremendous jump just in the last two or three years due to substance abuse by their mothers throughout pregnancy.

Dr. Richard Guy, who chairs Washington, D.C.'s Mayor's Advisory Board on Maternal and Infant Health, has estimated that an astonishing 45 to 50 percent of the mothers delivering babies in the District of Columbia today use drugs, and this is not an isolated case, cities ranging from Minneapolis to Oakland to Los Angeles have experienced a similar upswing, and I don't have to tell you that if this continues, literally, generational catastrophe could result. These children are very often born—almost always born with low birth rate and various mental problems; the first thing they do in life is experience withdrawal. Many of them are never claimed and spend up to a year in a nursery, with all sorts of psychological ramifications.

There is a trend toward prosecution of such mothers as child abusers in cases where they refuse treatment during pregnancy, and I believe this ought to be encouraged. Similarly, we ought to consider stronger penalties for using drugs in the presence of a minor child. There are tons and tons of living rooms where toddlers are exposed to that and where we know it, and it is not a serious crime at the moment.

There ought to be stronger penalties for recruiting children into criminal enterprises.

In addition, I think we have to think hard about holding parents accountable more firmly for the actions of their children, and we have very limited laws saying that parents are accountable for truancy, and there are some grandparent liability laws, so-called, where, if one of your minor children in a welfare household has a child of their own, the grandparent can, to some extent, be held responsible.

In some of the new curfew measures in cities, parents are being held responsible to a limited extent for the behavior of their chil-

dren. I think we need more of that. I think the first step in reducing juvenile delinquency has to be to make negligent parents, who are just kind of not exerting themselves in a proper way, exert some control over their charges.

I think we need the school safety program, which is fairly straightforward, I think, and I think the last and most general, and perhaps most important, thing we need is a full-fledged, honest to goodness attack on personal crime, not just juvenile crime but society-wide. I know there are lots of people who are going to tell us that we are already in the midst of such an attack, and they are wrong. Eighteen percent—these are current figures from the Bureau of Justice Statistics—of individuals arrested for violent felonies today are convicted and sentenced to at least a year in prison; it is only 10 percent for people arrested for drug felonies.

Amazingly, even among persons arrested for homicide, only 49 percent are sentenced to a year or more behind bars. The average inmate getting out of jail today has spent 17 months behind bars. That is just 45 percent of the average court-ordered sentence. If this is our war on crime, well, then, no wonder lots of people have decided to make crime a career in which occasional brief stays in jail are just part of the business, and we are seeing a lot of that. Four out of five State prison inmates today are repeat offenders. In fact, something like 45 percent of them are on at least their fourth sentence. So you are in for a year and a half, and you are out, and then you are in for maybe a year a couple of years later. Again, it has become a way of life. Along the way, many of these people are recruiting the young as criminal accomplices.

So, again, we have had lots of pretend wars on crime, but we haven't had a real one, and I think it is about time. Clearly, this will take some money, but, again, if anyone thinks we are overspending on the stick part of the carrot and stick approach to solving this, they are badly mistaken.

Nationally, only 2.9 percent of all Government spending in the latest year for which data is available was for criminal and civil justice, and that compares to 21 percent we spend on social insurance payments. We spend 13 percent for education, 7 percent for housing, 6 percent for public welfare, 4 percent for hospitals and health, all good things, but we are spending 2.9 percent for criminal justice to battle social disorder and personal violence. We are not overspending in that area.

But, of course, the bottom line is, money is not the answer here anyway. If I had time, I would like to touch on some of the recent events here in Washington as an example of how we have gotten ourselves into this box. It is fairly staggering when you look back at what was happening in this city just two years ago, before we had this big media blitz. We were back-peddling in exactly the opposite direction. We had a new sentencing bill which actually cut the amount of time that convicted persons spend in jail very severely, by 60 percent in many cases. This was passed in 1987. Again, the idea that this is somehow inexplicable or snuck up on us is not shared by all of us.

Even today, when we are in the midst of this giant crime backlash, the city government I don't think has demonstrated a serious response, in this city or in many others around the country. The

toughest things that we have done in Washington, D.C., so far are, institute a temporary extension of the police work week to six days; that is going to expire shortly for lack of funding; we have a weak, temporary—again, expires after 90 days in this case—curfew for youth; we have a hopelessly hamstrung anti-loitering provision, where you have got to put up police lines and you have got to post signs a few days in advance, as if this is going to somehow crack down on the open-air drug markets—also temporary, by the way. We have a temporary pretrail detention bill, which makes it somewhat easier for the city to hold accused people arrested for a felony who used a firearm in the course of it. That is due to lapse at the end of this year. Even these lukewarm, temporary measures have been opposed by a whole panoply of people.

The bottom line in all this, as Secretary Bennett recently pointed out, in this very bloodied and frightened city, of the 43,000 people arrested in the District in recent months—and the police, I think, are doing a wonderful job in that area—only 1,400 are now in jail, and the rest are out there doing their thing.

If I could just close, I guess I would close by just pointing out that crime doesn't wash all over all American equally. Obviously, it particularly terrorizes the weakest and the most vulnerable, and the 64 million children in this country, half of whom live in cities, one-quarter of whom come home to a house that contains no parent, a fifth of whom are in low-income households, all of them are physically frail and incompletely formed in character. Those are the people who suffer the most when law and order decays.

Children need order. In fact, aside from love, I would say there is nothing they need more than order. Yet we somehow haven't translated that into public policy. Law and order is often presented as a kind of conservative issue.

I would argue that there is a powerful bleeding heart, if you will, justification for getting tough on crime today, and that is on child welfare grounds. Physical safety and psychological security are the essential building blocks of healthy development. If you have got a good school, an accessible doctor, and a rich library, and a 15 percent increase in the Head Start budget, it is of precious little value to a child if he is sharing an apartment with his mother's abusive, violent, drug-selling boyfriend. I suggest that it is time to compile a new list of the "children's issues" and to put crime reduction at the top.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Karl Zinsmeister follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF KARL ZINSMEISTER, WRITER, CONSULTANT, ADJUNCT RESEARCH ASSOCIATE, AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH, WASHINGTON, DC

Thank you Chairman Miller, Congressman Bliley, Members of the committee. My name is Karl Zinsmeister. I am a writer and social demographic consultant here in Washington, DC, and an Adjunct Research Associate at the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. I am currently writing a book on the status and future prospects of America's children entitled The Child-Proof Society: Are Americans Losing Interest in the Next Generation? In the course of that effort I am looking at child welfare from a variety of angles, including that of public safety. What follows are some of my initial conclusions.

CHILDREN ADRIFT IN DISORDER

On May 12, 1987---almost exactly two years ago---an almost unnoticed event took place in this city that perfectly foreshadowed the mayhem involving children that has wracked Washington, DC since then. But this was before the subjects of crime and youth became hot topics in Washington and around the country, so almost no one commented upon what was---to me at least---a numbing event.

As a gesture toward public education, DC mayor Marion Barry substitute taught an eighth grade science class that day for gifted and talented students at Fletcher Johnson elementary school in southeast. The Mayor holds two degrees in chemistry, and in this particular class he was leading a discussion on the

food chain.

As talk turned to predation, then cannibalism, the Mayor posed a question. "We don't eat other people, we just kill other human beings. We shoot them, cut them. How many of you," Barry asked his pupils, "know somebody who's been killed?" There were nineteen students in the class. Fourteen hands shot up. The teacher went around the room: How were they killed? "Shot." "Hit by truck." "Stabbing." "Shot." "Shot." "Drugs." "Shot." The conversation quickly passed to another subject.

Remember, these were 13 year old children. And given that they were the gifted and talented class, you may assume they were from atypically privileged backgrounds compared to most of their classmates.

But on a day when the major news stories concerned Gary Hart's personal life and Robert McFarlane's testimony about what may have happened to $3.8 million in errant Iran-contra proceeds, this revelation that murder, overdose and mayhem have become a routine part of urban life for our young was barely reported, and not commented upon at all.

And this was hardly an unrepresentative event. Over a four month period in Detroit at about the same time 102 youngsters age 16 or under were shot, nearly all of them by other children. In October of 1987---well before the current media blitz on children and crime---the Wall Street Journal ran a stunning front page story which chronicled, diary-style, three months in the life of an eleven year old Chicago boy named Lafeyette Walton. That life included almost daily gun and submachine gun battles in his public housing project, beatings and maimings of relatives and

friends, recurrent rapes, gang recruiting, cocaine running by a nine-year old female cousin, and several murders.

A study completed recently by researchers at the University of Maryland School of Medicine in Baltimore helps quantify more precisely the extent of this type of trauma. A sample of 167 teenagers who visited a city center clinic for routine medical care were surveyed as to their exposure to various incidents of violence. The results: a stunning 23.5 percent had witnessed a murder. 71.5 percent knew someone who had been shot. These teenagers had been victims of some type of violence themselves an average of 1 1/2 times each, had witnessed more than five criminal episodes, and knew nearly 12 persons who had been crime victims. 22.9 percent had had their lives threatened, and 8.6 percent had been raped. The doctors collecting the information point out that because of the nature of their clinic population, nearly 80 percent of the respondents were females. Among a sample of adolescent males, it is likely many of these measures of violence exposure would be even higher.

Stunning as these specific findings are, I think most Americans have realized for some time that a substantial minority of our nation's youngest citizens are badly caught up in criminal violence. But there is a reality rub---acknowledging the extent of the carnage is just too disturbing, and combatting it would be too testing, so we have often looked the other way. That, however, is becoming increasingly difficult in the face of one outrage after another.

And so earnest souls are now asking how this problem "snuck

up" on us, and what its sources might be. Frankly, I don't understand the surprise. In the course of researching my book on how Americans regard their children I have looked at a wide range of social indicators. And one does not have to look very far into national trends in public safety, family cohesion, educational quality, willingness of parents to rear their own children when they are very young, and so forth, to see that the position of children in our society has eroded. Diminished child welfare is a national problem, affecting all groups. The decay has been most pronounced, however, in our inner cities.

For three decades we have sown the seeds of social disorder. Now we are reaping the harvest:

* Nearly one out of every four children born this year will arrive without benefit of married parents. Among blacks, more than 60 percent of all births occur out of wedlock.
* Divorce, and abandonment of children by their fathers, now take place at roughly twice the level of the post-war norm.
* Our society did not revolt against drug use until it became so entrenched that, today, 1.5 million children age 12 to 17 have tried cocaine or crack.
* The idea that every able-bodied adult should work and that families should aim for economic self-reliance was abandoned more than twenty years ago. Today, 40 percent of inner city men age 18 to 21 have not worked a single day in the last year.
* Anti-social individuals are rarely evicted from public housing anymore, and when they are it takes up to 8 to 10 months in our major cities. Most public housing is now, quite simply, a hellish place to grow up. Twenty years ago, this was not the

case.

* Effective discipline has disappeared in many public schools, to the point where every year now 1 in 20 teachers is physically assaulted, and one-quarter of all school principals report that student possession of weapons is a problem. The extent of our efforts to assure that the persons teaching our children remain diligent and committed is perhaps best illustrated by this fact: over a recent nine-year period a grand total of one principal was fired in the entire, pathetic, New York City public school system.

* And in our courts, the only thing standing between the vicious and predatory and the weak and dependent is often a revolving glass door.

Quite literally, large sections of urban American society have become nothing but crime factories. Given the grossly disordered conditions that prevail in many of our cities, there are those of us who would have been surprised if there had not been an upsurge of crime and violence among the young in recent years.

THE ROOTS OF CRIME IN FAMILY BREAKDOWN

Unquestionably, the most important root of our social dysfunction is family breakdown. The combined result of the illegitimacy and divorce trends sketched out above is that more than 60 percent of all children born today will spend at least some time in a single parent household before reaching age 18. The regression now taking place in American family structure is, as one analyst has pointed out, "without precedent in urban

history." Not only stable family life but even marriage itself is, "now almost a forgotten institution among black teens," to use the words of a recent report by one child welfare organization.

There is a great divide over the cause of this decay. On the one side there is, let us say, the Charles Murray school that argues government incentives have been a primary motive cause of the collapse of personal responsibility. On the other shore we might identify as the Daniel Patrick Moynihan position the view that the primary motive cause is a mystery, but probably cultural, and that government intervention is our best hope for a solution. The significant fact of the 1980s debate, however, is not the split over government's role, but agreement that the mortal threat in all this is collapse of traditional family structure. Today, unlike in the 1960s, both sides recognize personal behavior as the prime source of contemporary social and economic problems.

So: there is wide agreement that family structure is now the principal conduit of class structure. This is not to deny that plenty of children from intact families will have problems, nor that many offspring from single-parent families will grow up to be happy and successful citizens. But then even some of the children growing up in Beirut today will turn out fine too, nonetheless it is not to be recommended. The point is, having only one-parent's time and energy and earning and teaching power is a serious blow against a child that he or she will overcome only with effort.

That is not personal prejudice, but the verdict of the sociological literature. Let me quote from a longitudinal study

of children of one-parent families put out by the National Association of Elementary School Principals:

> One-parent children, on the whole, show lower achievement in school than their two-parent peers....Among all two-parent children, 30 percent were ranked as high achievers, compared to only 1 percent of one-parent children. At the other end of the scale....only 2 percent of two-parent children were low achievers---while fully 40 percent of the one-parent children fell in that category.
>
> There are more clinic visits among one-parent students. And their absence rate runs far higher than for students with two parents, with one-parent students losing about eight days more over the course of the year.
>
> One-parent students are consistently more likely to be late, truant, and subject to disciplinary action by every criterion we examined, and at both the elementary and secondary levels...one-parent children are more than twice as likely as two-parent children to give up on school altogether.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics reported recently that 70 percent of the juveniles in state reform institutions grew up in single-parent or no-parent families. Most street gang members, it has been shown, come from broken homes. And one recent study of 72 adolescent murderers found that 75 percent came from non-intact families.

But, again, these findings ought not surprise us. Fully twenty four years ago Daniel Patrick Moynihan observed that:

> From the wild Irish slums of the 19th century Eastern seaboard to the riot torn suburbs of Los Angeles, there is one unmistakable lesson in American history: a community that allows a large number of young men (and women) to grow up in broken families, dominated by women, never acquiring any stable relationship to male authority, never acquiring any set of rational expectations about the future...that community asks for and gets chaos.

One of the depressing lessons we have learned since that was written is how unamenable the problems of the broken family are to monetary solutions. It is not that we haven't tried to make society-wide compensations for the withering of the nuclear unit.

Two-thirds of all female-headed families with children under 13 now get benefits from a welfare program (AFDC, General Assistance, SSI, Medicaid, food stamps, rent assistance), the Census Bureau tells us. Among unmarried mothers, over 80 percent are receiving a government check. Among minorities, the ratios are much higher. The Federal government spends more than $100 billion every year on means-tested payments to families. Yet this assistance has not even come close to providing those households with the kind of existential security that most intact families enjoy.

For the last quarter century, American public policy has shied from the idea that certain family forms are more socially desirable than others. An idiotic neutrality has worked its way into the tax code, our property laws, our marriage and family statutes, our entitlement and welfare programs, and so forth, suggesting in the face of contrary evidence that from the point of view of larger social functioning, any one family form is as good as another. There is no attempt to support and encourage childbearing within wedlock, there is little penalty attached to child abandonment, there is little recognition of the social benefits of marriage, or of the social contributions of those who devote themselves to conscientous childrearing, there is no reward in our transfer programs for standing by kith and kin. (For just one example, since the end of World War II intact families with children have gone from being a group enjoying substantial income tax advantages to one experiencing a relative penalty.)

The most tragic aspect of this lack of nerve in defending

the integrity of the nuclear family is that it misled and left badly exposed precisely those groups who had fewest other assets to fall back on. The rich can afford splintered families---though it may bring them heartache it is not likely to incapacitate them. But the ill-educated, the poor, the historically discriminated against---these groups once enticed out of the safe harbor of family solidarity often cannot recover.

The end result of all this is that a significant minority of American children is now growing up amidst appalling disorder. That this is hurting them is transparently clear. Childhood stress is up, with more children seeing doctors and being admitted to psychiatric wards. The teenage suicide rate has more than tripled in thirty years, a time when suicide rates for all other age groups were falling. Youth drug abuse has levelled off in recent years, but it remains very high compared to earlier decades, and among underclass youngsters serious drug abuse has rooted deeply. And of course we are experiencing an unprecedented crime wave directed at and by juveniles.

In the most troubling cases, we are seeing a pattern of extreme remorselessness in youth crime. The Central Park attack, where the perpetrators reported "it was fun" is the latest, heinous, example. An earlier case in Washington saw a group of youths rob, gang rape and murder a 99-pound middle-aged mother named Catherine Fuller while singing and joking. In another case a 17 year-old shot an unsuspecting cab driver in the head "because he wanted to try out a gun." In a third, two teenagers killed another youth who passed them on the street because they

wanted his "boom box" radio. Many other similarly disturbing cases exist. At homicide scenes across the country, investigators report that juveniles are often found laughing and playing.

Some observers have identified a pattern of crimes by children who do not seem to have a conscience. These analysts point out that most such individuals have been so-called "unattached children," who never form a satisfactory relationship with a primary caregiver. In cases of child neglect, early and impersonal daycare, some divorces and certain other instances---with several of these factors on the upswing---it is believed that a child can grow up never having learned to trust or love any one person. In some such unattached children, partial psychopathic symptoms result. Seemingly inexplicable brutality can follow.

WHEN CHILDREN BECOME VICTIMIZERS

This brings us to an important point: the origins and influences of childhood disturbance are of undeniable interest to public policy makers. If we can identify those children who are threatened by the turmoil swirling around them, possibly some of that turmoil can be reduced. But I would suggest strongly that once a particular juvenile has himself committed a serious crime, the "whys" can no longer be a central issue. At that point, justice must be pursued---for the sake of the aggrieved, and to maintain the essential proposition that crime brings on punishment. Often we become paralyzed trying to decide whether the juvenile criminal is a victim or victimizer. That leads to very dangerous territory.

The last DC policeman to be killed in the line of duty was shot by a 17-year-old in the process of burgling a clothing store while on PCP. His criminal record began at age 10, when he was charged with sexually assaulting a 5-year-old. In subsequent years he was arrested for robbery, force and violence; then grand larceny, assault with intent to rob, obstruction of justice, and second-degree burglary; then robbery, force and violence, and assault with attempt to rob; then second-degree burglary; and, one year before shooting the police officer, with assault with a deadly weapon. In failing to punish these offenses as the serious crimes they were, an ineffectual juvenile justice system merely extended a tragic trail of heartache further than it need have led.

And this is a particularly risky moment for us to indulge juvenile lawlessness. In just the last few years, in several American cities the number of juveniles arrested for drug distribution exceeded the number arrested for drug possession for the first time. A lost generation has just graduated from victim to victimizer. If we hope to have any chance of preventing them from infecting a class of successors, and from stalking an innocent public, then we must see with clear eyes what they have become: sad cases, now part of the problem. Unless this current crop of teenage marauders is incapacitated, we will institutionalize the vicious cycle of youths preyed upon and then preying on others.

That would bring not only a host of personal tragedies, but also a terrible social cost. Homicide is now the leading cause of death for children in American inner cities. Among blacks

there was a 15 percent nationwide increase in homicides just from 1985 to 1986. Given the trends around the country in the last two years, that figure will rise sharply again when the 1987 and 1988 figures become available. In fact, the loss of life among young blacks has already become so dramatic as to drag down overall life expectancy rates for all black Americans for two years running, an unprecedented event in a developed country. While white life expectancy was rising, the black rate fell for the second consecutive year in 1986, all the way back to its level in 1982. This was basically a reflection of the epidemic of young blacks killing other young blacks. Only unflinching legal intervention will break this tragic circle.

SOLUTIONS

I suggest our response to the current upsurge of child crime must be multi-part:

To begin, we need positive measures to strengthen family integrity and independence. More rhetoric and more action reinforcing the two-parent family as the preferred locus of childbearing is called for. We also need to improve the general family atmosphere in this country, through the tax code, through expanded support for childrearers, with a better public education system. We ought to aim to help parents by giving them more choice, more independence, more responsibility.

Two, we need to consider some negative sanctions against parents and other adults who threaten and prey upon children. For instance, we are now experiencing an epidemic of children born physically damaged and addicted to drugs due to substance

abuse by their mothers throughout pregnancy. Dr. Richard Guy, who chairs Washington, DC's Mayor's Advisory Board on Maternal and Infant Health has estimated that an astonishing 45 to 50 percent of the mothers delivering babies in the District of Columbia today use drugs. Cities ranging from Minneapolis to Oakland to Los Angeles are experiencing a similar upswing. If this continues, generational catastrophe could result. There is a trend toward prosecution of such mothers as child abusers in cases where they refuse treatment during pregnancy. This ought to be encouraged. Similarly, we ought to consider stronger penalties for using drugs in the presence of minor children, for recruiting children into criminal enterprises, and so forth. As Pliney the Elder said, "What is done to children they will do to society."

In addition, parents ought to be held more closely accountable for the actions of children involved in anti-social behavior. We already have limited laws, for instance, holding parents responsible for truancy and early school dropout by children, and for support of a grandchild born to one of their minor children in a welfare household. There is growing agreement that keeping control of one's children ought to be a condition of residence in public housing. Real sanctions should be meted out against parents when juveniles violate youth curfews in those cities where they exist. The very first step in any effort to control juvenile delinquency must be to make negligent parents exert some control over their charges.

Next, we must take strong steps to improve safety and order in our public schools. The schools are the primary public

institution in the lives of our children, and if disorder is allowed to root there children get a powerfully negative impression of society's interest in protecting them. Schools must be safe harbors, where bodily integrity if nothing else is guaranteed. This will require strong support for teachers and principals exerting discipline at the schoolhouse level, it will require making suspensions and expulsions of miscreant students stick, in some places it will require institution of metal detectors, more guards, student ID cards, suspension of lunch time building-leaving privileges, occasional random searches, and so forth. Squeamishness about taking such measures often reflects the public relations worries of administrators more than anything else. Violence has already entered our schools. To pretend otherwise for appearances' sake is unconscionable.

More generally, we need to proceed with a full-fledged, society-wide, crackdown on personal crime. There are those who will tell you we are currently in the midst of just such a clean-up. They are wrong. The excellent figures produced by the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics show that only 18 percent of individuals arrested for violent felonies are presently convicted and sentenced to at least a year in prison. The figure is just 10 percent of those individuals arrested for drug felonies. Amazingly, even among persons arrested for homicide, only 49 percent are sentenced to a year or more behind bars. For rapists it's only 29 percent.

Overall, the average inmate getting out of jail these days has spent 17 months behind bars. That is just 45 percent of the original court-ordered sentence. In other words, you have

relatively little chance of going to jail even if you are arrested, and if you do, you'll probably spend less than a year and a half locked up. That's our war on crime?

It's no wonder, then, that for many criminals a short prison term has become just part of the business. Our failure to discourage crime can perhaps best be seen in this fact: four out of five state prison inmates today are repeat offenders. In fact, 45 percent of them are on at least their fourth sentence! These people are making crime a lucrative career, and why not, when these are the only penalties? Along the way, many of them are recruiting the young as criminal accomplises.

Our prisons are crowded today because there is little motive for criminals---particularly juveniles, who experience especially light treatment---to avoid illegal activity. The only long-run solution is to bite the bullet and build adequate new prisons, then make sentences stick. If we're going to give young people an incentive to stay out of prison, we've got to make sure they know they're going to be there a while if they commit serious crimes against their neighbors.

This will of course take some money. But the fact is, the Federal government has been slighting criminal justice spending for some time. From 1979 to 1985, total Federal spending for all purposes rose by 92 percent (unadjusted for inflation). Federal spending for justice activities, meanwhile, rose at the much slower rate of 68 percent. Nationally, only 2.9 percent of all government spending in 1985 was for criminal and civil justice. That compares to 20.8 percent for social insurance payments, 13.0

percent for education, 6.8 percent for housing and the environment, 6.0 percent for public welfare, 4.0 percent for hospitals and health. We are not overspending in our battle against social disorder and personal violence.

But of course spending is the least of our problem in the arena of crime prevention. To see just how pitiful our efforts against interpersonal violence have been, let's look back briefly at events here in Washington, our capital city. They are representative of developments in many other places across the country. I would begin by reminding you that behind the lipservice being paid to crime fighting now that we are in the midst of an emergency, as recently as early 1987 our D.C. Council and Mayor passed new legislation that cut the sentences served by prison inmates to levels well <u>below</u> the minimum period ordered by the presiding judge. Under the new law, which is the regimen currently in place, a prisoner serving, for instance, a court-ordered minimum sentence of 5 years for robbery can have his term reduced 60 percent for "good behavior" and be released after serving two years and one month. (Nearly all inmates are currently being qualified for "good behavior.")

At about this same time that it was trivializing criminal sentencing the city government staged a day-long drug summit that involved 2,000 persons and cost $93,000. This conclave generated 151 official recommendations for how the District should combat drug abuse. Among them were a call for urine testing for school age children, a limitation of the use of sugar (which was described as a "dangerous drug" because of its effect on the human body), a call for recognition that racism is a "fundamental

cause" of drug abuse and establishment of more childhood education on racism's effects, and a novel call for city payments of $20,000 to every black man in the District on the grounds that it would be less costly to pay black men to avoid drugs than it is to incarcerate them.

Today, the dithering is somewhat less tragi-comic, but we still have not put forth a serious, clear-eyed response to the city's drug and murder epidemic. The strongest measures instituted so far are a temporary extension of the police work week to 6 days (which will expire shortly for lack of funding); a weak, temporary (90 day) curfew for youth; an unworkable anti-loitering measure, also temporary; and a temporary pretrial detention bill which makes it somewhat easier for the city to hold accused persons charged with firearms violations in the commission of a felony (due to lapse at the end of the year). And even these lukewarm measures have been resisted by some local officials, by a variety of special interests, by the American Civil Liberties Union, and others. Secretary William J. Bennett recently pointed out the sad bottom line for our bloodied and frightened city: of the 43,000 people arrested in the District in recent months, only 1,400 are now in jail. The rest are out there doing their thing.

"KIDS NEED ORDER"---CRIME AS A PRE-EMINENT CHILDREN'S ISSUE

Crime does not wash over all Americans equally. It particularly terrorizes the weakest and most vulnerable among us. America's 64 million children---half of them living in cities, one-quarter of them coming home after school to a house

containing no parent, a fifth living in low income households, all of them physically frail and incompletely formed in character---these are the individuals who suffer most when law and order decays. Children need order. Aside from love there is nothing they need more than order.

Yet, somehow, we have failed miserably to insulate our children from even the grossest criminal activity. It seems especially incongruous to me that none---not one---of the self-styled children's defense organizations have identified public order as an issue of preeminent importance to the young. Why no outcry for tougher laws, tougher sentencing, more police and prison space, safer schools, and fewer drugs from those who claim to speak on behalf of children?

Law and order is often presented as a "conservative" issue, but today there is a powerful "bleeding heart" justification for getting tough on crime---on child welfare grounds. Physical safety and psychological security are the essential foundations for a child's health, education and overall development. A good school, an accessible doctor, a rich library, a 15 percent increase in the Head Start budget are of little use to a child sharing an apartment with his mother's abusive, violent, drug-selling boyfriend. Millions of American children are now haunted by mean streets. It is time to compile a new list of "the children's issues," and to put crime reduction at the top.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you very much.

Ms. Simms, let me ask you something. When the children are brought in for different offenses—and I say children because we are dealing in some instances with relatively young individuals—how do they handle them? I asked this question earlier of Judge Walton whether the families were in court or not, and he suggested, no, families don't come to court for the most part, or, in some instances, it may be a mother or grandmother. But at the time of arrest, when they are being processed, are families called?

Captain SIMMS. Yes, they are. They are contacted with each arrest. Oftentimes, they will come in. If not, the child is sent to the receiving house, and sometimes the parents may go to the receiving house, and the child will leave with them.

Chairman MILLER. Is information taken about the child in terms of prior activity, or the child having trouble, or trying to discern what is going on?

Captain SIMMS. Yes. We would have prior records indicating whether or not the child had come before us before, whether it was contact or noncriminal activity or for committing a crime. We would check into that to get a basic background of the child and relay this information to the court system.

Chairman MILLER. I assume, when you look at the number of arrests and the number of people, a good number of these young people are known to the department, to the arresting officer. How do they handle them? Is an effort made at diversion, or are they just run through?

Captain SIMMS. In the diversion process, we do not divert what we consider hard-core kids, kids that are consistently in trouble. These are basically first-time offenders for minor offenses. It may have been for disorderly—dropping trash—something where they are mischievous more than anything else. We bring them in, they are counseled, their parents are contacted, and normally they go home.

Chairman MILLER. You usually get a decent response out of parents?

Captain SIMMS. I think about 75 percent of the time we get a positive response.

Chairman MILLER. Professor Elliott, I don't know if you were in the room for the earlier discussion with the panel, but some of the points you made in terms of the notion of whether or not a child bonds either to a positive peer group, to the family, or to an institution seems somewhat consistent with what we have heard from the previous panel in terms of where there are resources available for this to happen either within the family and/or various institutions with which the child comes into contact. But you are suggesting that this is more than a casual process that is taking place out there—I mean the notion that a child is happy in school or not is not really indicative of whether or not the child really gets reinforced in a positive fashion at that school. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct. I guess what concerns me is, a lot of the things that we do at school and elsewhere really facilitate the separation of kids in such a way that you get the emergence of a deviant subculture.

We are talking about tracking and ability grading, which were done for very legitimate purposes, but the net effect of that is that kids are told subtly that they are losers, and they are put into a special track with other kids who are losers, and that facilitates the emergence of this kind of group process that we are talking about. So it happens in a number of different ways.

What concerns me is that we are not very sensitive to this problem in the way that we go about organizing or structuring the processes that we use in particular institutions like the schools.

Part of what is happening, of course, is that these kids are becoming increasingly isolated. They are being cut off. They are being cut off from all conventional institutions. They are being cut off from families and school. They are being cut off, and the only reference groups they have are other kids. The only role models they have are other kids.

Chairman MILLER. My concern, which I tried to express earlier, is that in all of our investigations in the committee, you just start to see a stronger and stronger magnet, if you will, in terms of whether it is violence, or drugs, or negative role models, but you don't see counter-magnetic fields for these kids.

Again, we always harp on when we grew up. These are different times, different stresses, and everything else. But yet, whether it starts with the family or ends with the school or somewhere in between, the counter force just doesn't seem to be present in a number of these young people's lives, and, as a result, they may be making what almost is a logical decision in terms of engaging in activity. At least they get some response.

Mr. ELLIOTT. They get support, they are going to get recognition, and they are going to get some status from other kids. Those are the kinds of kids they are going to go to.

One of the things that was mentioned earlier in the discussion about schools, by the principal in the Central Park school, really makes a lot of good sense to me, because going to smaller schools is going to increase the possibility that you are going to get some genuine mentoring taking place.

One of the things we know is that if there is a significant adult in a kid's life, it is a protective factor for getting too far into a delinquent peer group or a deviant peer group. It doesn't necessarily have to be a parent. In many cases, it is a teacher who simply takes an interest, enough interest that a personal bond is established, and when that happens, very often, that is enough to serve to protect a kid from putting all of his emotional and social supports into a deviant peer group.

Chairman MILLER. It is interesting because that reinforces, again, testimony on other subject matters involving many of the same kids. We have been told time and again that when you look at, why does one kid succeed and another kid doesn't, they live side by side in the same family, same apartment, same school district—however you want to measure it—very often people have responded, because somebody was cheering for that kid. It may have been a sister, it may have been a grandmother, it may have been a guy down the block or the grocery man, but somebody said, "All right, you got a C," or, "Great, you caught a pass," or whatever it is in the child's life that is going on at that time.

Down here at Eastern High School just a few blocks from here, the principal said the same thing. The kids that are studying German and taking Chemistry—and it is all AFDC, the whole Census tract—essentially said that somebody is rooting, somebody is there, he said. It can be a broken home, or it can be a lot of things, but somebody is making that connection with that person. This keeps coming up time and again in terms of role models.

You talk about the isolation in this community and the Chicago community, and you read about this, and you start to think, "Where would this young kid go to get a role model?" You could get on the bus, I guess, and go downtown and find one maybe, but in the environ, where they are mobile, and let's just assume it is 10 square blocks or something. It is pretty difficult to find that role model. The men that are present are unemployed or employed at rather menial jobs. There isn't a reinforcement. And I dare say that most of the women that are raising the family are carrying about 19 different tasks during the day just in terms of health and safety and development.

Mr. ELLIOTT. What we know is that in many communities there are people there in the community who are playing that role. Recently, I heard the story about Sweet Alice in Watts. There is a woman who doesn't have any Federal grant or any funds but who is simply taking an interest in the kids who live on her street. She knows them. When they are in trouble, she takes them in. She is playing that kind of role.

We got into conversation at the end of the last panel, and I'm not sure that I see the Federal role as investing dollars into programs, quite frankly. I think the Federal role is helping to disseminate the kinds of models, the kinds of programs, that are going to work.

We went through a cycle earlier. I evaluated all the programs the old Office of Youth Development was doing, the youth service bureaus. We got lots of Federal money to set up these youth service bureaus, and the fact of the matter is, many of them worked very well. As soon as the Federal dollars gave out, they disappeared, because the community hadn't bought into them, the community wasn't willing to pay for them. The fact of the matter is, if your community and if your neighborhoods are not willing to do those kinds of things, I'm with you, I don't think there is a will.

Chairman MILLER. I couldn't agree with you more, but I guess I have a problem with that then being interpreted that, you know, with Federal dollars, you can't throw money at a problem, and all the cliches we have heard for the last decade, because when I visit my community I see programs that are working, but they are so overwhelmed by the numbers that they have no ability to deal with it. I see social workers taking care of 40, 50, 60 cases, and knowing the kinds of contacts that means. No wonder the kid is lost somewhere out there in the foster care system.

But I agree with you that at some point the community either has to switch on or switch off here in terms of whether they really care about these kids.

One of the things that this committee has tried to do is to really look at local programs that are working. They come in all ranges, sizes, and shapes and all levels of Federal participation, or no Fed-

eral participation, but, really, what it is about a community that finally says, "We think these kids are important" in one aspect or another. It can be sexually abused kids, or adolescent suicide, or sports, or any side of the street. You see a lot of community efforts, but they are picking up a very small number of children in that community.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is true. That is certainly true. But there is a sort of invisible social network out there that is even more important to support. That is, by the time the kids get into our resocializing or correctional institutions, it is too late. Kids who are making it, who are living in these kinds of neighborhoods, are kids who have a support system. They know adults, they are integrated, and these kids have a support network there. It is not largely visible. It is not social workers, et cetera. It is family, it is neighbors, it is adults who are taking an interest in them, who provide that kind of support and insulate them from this overbonding and overcommitment to the adolescent peer group, which for some kids is the only stable form of social organization that is available to them in their neighborhoods.

Chairman MILLER. You are comfortable with your very early statement that you think this is essentially the same number of kids that are more violent, with access to arms, the overlay of drugs?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I believe that the best evidence—and it is limited—suggests that that is the primary source of what we are seeing in the way of the increased number of violent events.

Chairman MILLER. With new overlays on that population.

Mr. ELLIOTT. There are some new overlays. We talk about three. Drugs clearly are implicated in the maintenance of violence, and extending the career; the unemployment in our areas of poverty have also extended the career; and then, in addition to that, if there was one thing we could do—you say we can't do it—but if there is one thing that would cut the levels of violence significantly, it would be to reduce access to guns.

Chairman MILLER. You will get no disagreement out of me. I strongly agree with that.

I remember when I first came to Congress being told by various people involved in the criminal justice system, the police chiefs, that we could expect an aging of this population and we would sort of grow or age our way out of what was then considered the crime problem 15 years ago, that those of us of the baby boom generation who were involved in crime would get old and tired. What worries me is, I see it working down the age ladder a little bit. What you are suggesting is the extension of these careers, and maybe we are not saying the fact that this is going to work its way out as population ages because of these overlays on our population. It worries me that you could end up with a greater number of people being involved by virtue of career extensions.

Mr. Zinsmeister, you are writing very furiously over there.

Mr. ZINSMEISTER. You are right. It is a good point you raise, I think. Not only was it said that we would age our way out of this, we were beginning to. I mean there was a decline in crime rates as that big swell of people in the prime ages to commit crimes aged. But then we had a tremendous reversal very recently, and I would

be less willing to say—in fact, I would not say that I am convinced that we have a stable population. In terms of the University of Michigan study on drug use——

Chairman MILLER. I think it was the same proportion of adolescents.

Mr. ZINSMEISTER. Right.

Chairman MILLER. Not a stable crime population. They may now be moving into 24- and 26-year-olds.

Mr. ZINSMEISTER. Right.

Chairman MILLER. Okay.

Mr. ZINSMEISTER. If you look at the drug use, for instance, there is evidence from the Michigan studies that use among certain age groups—high school seniors I guess it is—has declined over time. Nonetheless, it is also clear that among a certain kind of category of youth it has become more entrenched and that the drugs of choice have become much stronger.

Chairman MILLER. When I ask kids that are involved in the drug business about that study, they say, "Yeah, that's an interesting study, but we are not in school."

Mr. ELLIOTT. We have the same findings from the National Youth Survey, which is a household-based study, that has the dropouts, has the people that are not in school. There is a slightly higher rate, but from a national perspective it is not going to change that declining trend.

But remember, that is a national sample. You are absolutely right, in certain subpopulations it is becoming more concentrated, but that is one of the overlays that we were talking about earlier. In certain segments of our society, it clearly is happening.

Chairman MILLER. Do we need strategies for those populations?

Mr. ELLIOTT. We certainly do.

Chairman MILLER. I mean right now I think we try to provide drug monies for every congressional district, each gets a little hit here; we are kind of addicts on the money side of it. If you could deal with New York, Chicago, L.A., you would be dealing with about 50 percent of the problem.

Mr. ELLIOTT. For a lot of problems.

Chairman MILLER. A lot of problems.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I do want to comment, however, that, again, if you are looking at it from the standpoint of violent behavior and crime, the race, class, residence, gender kinds of differences are not nearly as great as we tend to assume. That is, it is true that there is more violence on the part of lower class people living in urban lower class areas, and particularly minority areas. But we are not talking about ratios of two to one, three to one, or four to one. There is a lot of violence in middle class families, a lot of violence, and there is a lot of violence in middle class junior and senior high schools. That has sort of been forgotten here because of the apparent concentration which appears in our official statistics. But I hate to say this; probably 80 percent of what goes on never gets into official statistics; it is hidden, but the violence is there, and those people who are most vulnerable to getting into the official statistics are those who come from these disadvantaged backgrounds. But the problem is not only there.

Chairman MILLER. No, no, no. I think this committee has learned that very well. So many of these numbers are one in four, one in five. It can't all be there.

Mr. ELLIOTT. What happens is that certain people are more vulnerable to the official process than others. We know that the people who are using drugs are more likely to be picked up for a crime, a nondrug crime. We know that those who have mental health problems are more vulnerable to the arrest process. So what you get in the arrest population is not representative of who is actually involved in the behavior.

Chairman MILLER. Well, thank you very, very much. This, I think, is going to be the first of one or two other hearings on the same subject. Hopefully the overview you have provided has given us a chance to split it apart a little bit, pull it apart, and look at some of these overlays, some of the concentrations of the problem. This has been very, very helpful to me and to the committee, and I appreciate your taking the time to be with us. It is obviously going to get continued attention. We would like to think that the role of this committee is that we can provide a certain level of information and education to other Members of Congress that don't get the benefit of this kind of hearing when they are trying to figure out how to report out the bill of the hour, and we can pass that on. So thank you very, very much for your help and your time.

[Whereupon, at 1 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

[Material submitted for inclusion in the record follows:]

...HE ONE HUNDRED FIRST CONGRESS
GEORGE MILLER, CALIFORNIA
CHAIRMAN
WILLIAM LEHMAN, FLORIDA
PATRICIA SCHROEDER, COLORADO
...ROY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS, LOUISIANA
MATTHEW F. MCHUGH, NEW YORK
TED WEISS, NEW YORK
BERYL ANTHONY, JR., ARKANSAS
BARBARA BOXER, CALIFORNIA
SANDER M. LEVIN, MICHIGAN
BRUCE A. MORRISON, CONNECTICUT
...ROY ROWLAND, GEORGIA
JERRY SIKORSKI, MINNESOTA
ALAN WHEAT, MISSOURI
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, CALIFORNIA
LANE EVANS, ILLINOIS
RICHARD J. DURBIN, ILLINOIS
DAVID E. SKAGGS, COLORADO
BILL SARPALIUS, TEXAS

ANN ROSEWATER
STAFF DIRECTOR

TELEPHONE 226-7660

U.S. House of Representatives

SELECT COMMITTEE ON
CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES
385 HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING ANNEX 2
WASHINGTON, DC 20515

May 19, 1989

THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR., VIRGINIA
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER
FRANK R. WOLF, VIRGINIA
BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH, NEVADA
RON PACKARD, CALIFORNIA
...DERRICK HASTERT, ILLINOIS
CLYDE C. HOLLOWAY, LOUISIANA
FRED GRANDY, IOWA
CURT WELDON, PENNSYLVANIA
LAMAR S. SMITH, TEXAS
PETER SMITH, VERMONT
JAMES T. WALSH, NEW YORK
RONALD K. MACHTLEY, RHODE ISLAND

DENNIS G. SMITH
MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR
CAROL M. STATUTO
MINORITY DEPUTY STAFF DIRECTOR

TELEPHONE 226-7660

Carl C. Bell, M.D., Director
Community Mental Health Council
8704 So. Constance Avenue
Chicago, IL 60617

Dear Dr. Bell:

Thank you for your participation in our hearing, "Down These Mean Streets: Violence By and Against America's Children," held earlier this week. I was especially moved by your eloquent description of the psychic toll which violence is taking on minority communities.

In an effort to conserve time, Representative Lamar Smith asked that witnesses be permitted to respond in writing to questions. The following are the questions he has directed to you:

1. Elaborate on your statement, "grass roots community efforts need support." Tell us more about Save Our Sons and Daughters in Detroit and Black-o-Black Love Campaign in Chicago. How have such groups been successful?

We would appreciate your forwarding the answer to this question to the committee as soon as possible so that it may be included in the printed record of the hearing.

Once again, thanks for your appearance before the committee, and I look forward to additional opportunities to work together.

Sincerely,

George Miller

GEORGE MILLER
Chairman
Select Committee on Children,
Youth, and Families

CC: Hon. Thomas J. Bliley, Jr.
Hon. Lamar S. Smith

JUN 0 7 1989

Board of Directors

President
Audley F. Connor Jr. M.D.
President, Medical Staff
Jackson Park Hospital
& Medical Center

Vice President
Freddye Smith
Certified Financial Planner
Waddell & Reed, Inc.

Secretary
Waymon Martin
Manager of Human Resources
Centel Corporation

Treasurer
Hamilton B. Talbert

Shaffdeen A. Amuwo
Assistant Dean, Student Affairs
School of Public Health
University of Illinois at Chicago

Veronica Westley Burns
Human Resource Consultant
Harris Trust & Savings Bank

Evelyn Byrdsong
Intake Administrator
Illinois Department of Public Aid

Risa R. Davis
Vice President
Citicorp North America, Inc.

William Farrow
Vice President/Head, Trading
Products Group Marketing
First National Bank of Chicago

Ronald E. Franklin
Vice President/Director of
Research Services
Burrell Advertising, Inc.

Bill Harlan
Coordinator
Adult Learning Skills Program
Olive-Harvey College

Rev. Dahryl F. James
Rector
Messiah & St. Bartholomew
Episcopal Church

Anthony Leggett
Staff Accountant
Vienna Sausage
Manufacturing Company

Melba Lewis
Principal
Simpson Alternative School

Sara Lindholm
President
City Lands Corporation

Loretta Martin
Guidance Counselor
Wendell Phillips High School

Velma Morman
Professor of Counseling
Olive-Harvey College

Anne Coggs Myles
Attorney
Anne C. Myles P.C. & Associates

Domistene G. Neely
Vice President
Neely Bros. Enterprises

James Palmer Sr.
Consultant
Executive Service Corps

Ada M. Phillips
Columnist
Chicago Daily Defender

Mazie Robinson
Assistant Coordinator
Information & Referral Unit
Chicago Department on
Aging & Disability

Executive Director
Carl C. Bell, M.D., F.A.P.A.

community mental health council

8704 South Constance Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60617
Phone: 312/734-4033

June 2, 1989

The Honorable George Miller
Chairman
Select Committee on Children,
Youth and Families
385 House Office Building, Annex 2
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Miller:

In response to your request that I elaborate on the statement "grass roots community efforts need support" and how the "Save Our Son's and Daughters" in Detroit and the "Black-on-Black Love Campaign" in Chicago have been successful, I would reply the following:

Over the past five years I've been traveling around the country lending my minuscule expertise, seeking out local grass root community efforts and trying to cross fertilize the methods and ideas I've learned. I've discovered several grass root, self help, community efforts.

The Black-on-Black Love Campaign in Chicago began in the early 1980's after an employee of Soft Sheen Hair Care Products was attacked. Mr. Ed. Gardner (president of Soft Sheen) began the Black-on-Black Love Project and designed it to emphasize Love, Respect, and Discipline in the black community. These efforts were supported by concrete programs placed in the black community. The Black-on-Black Love staff developed an advisory board (I'm proud to say I've been on the board from the start) to help them with the city-wide "No Crime Day" which is proceeded by "No Crime Week." During the week several no crime activities are supported - neighborhood watch programs, finger printing kids, elder support programs, etc. (see enclosure). No Crime Day finishes with a big picnic and rally in the park. In addition, during the year the Black-on-Black Love staff visit prisons and jails to talk to inmates about crime and what it costs. Further, the program has adopted a housing development

community mental health council

"We Dare To Care"

in the Robert Taylor homes and put in a library, computer lab, and ceramics shop. They put a large mural on the outside of the building which reads "Replace Black-on-Black Crime with Black-on-Black Love." Reportedly, graffiti is no longer on the walls, the elevators remain clean from when the residents cleaned up, and gang recruitment and violence is down in that building. The hope is that the responsibility shown by Mr. Gardner will be contagious and other buildings will be "adopted." Black-on-Black Love has also aided in getting people jobs. The "No Crime Day" idea has spread to other cities like Detroit and if nothing else lends hope to a bad situation.

Blacks Mobilized Against Crime (B-MAC) in Richmond, Virginia, began its efforts about 4 years ago when Richmond was at the top of a murder per capita list. Mr. Robert Bobb, city manager, identified the problem and called me down to consult. As a result, Richmond has developed the most synergistic approach to the homicide problem I've witnessed. The public health nurses screen for violence in families when they screen for high blood pressure, the school board plans to adopt Dr. Prothow-Stiths Peer Violence Prevention Curriculum once they find a new superintendent. The police have developed a Selected Neighborhood Action Patrol (i.e., beat police) for high crime areas, several black churches have taken responsibility for the violence problem and are promoting conflict resolution classes and encouraging scholarship and legitimate teen activity for teenagers. The police have begun an athletic league. Further, each year they have a rally to keep the issue on the front burner.

Save Our Sons and Daughters (SOSAD) in Detroit began due to a death of a mother's child (see newsletter) and revolves around a group of parents whose children have suffered from violence. They have been supportive of one another, helped start addressing grief counseling of families who suffer from violence, pushed for Peer Violence Prevention Curriculum, raised consciousness about the issue, etc.

New Orleans Association of Black Social Workers' Anti-Violence Program has targeted several high crime area schools and have mapped out a strategy to begin to look at school violence with a play, counseling in the schools of high risk kids, etc.

Finally, I've seen similar efforts by other groups in Oklahoma City, OK; Cleveland, OH; Cincinnati, OH; Flint, MI; Baltimore, MD; Milwaukee, WI; etc. all of which have begun to raise consciousness about their particular area and all of which have begun to push for some or most of the solutions I put in my testimony. I suspect once public policy reflects some of what I've seen work on a small scale by grass roots community efforts the violence epidemic America currently suffers from will begin to heal.

Sincerely,

Carl C Bell, MD
jw

Carl C. Bell, M.D.
Executive Director

CCB:jw

Enclosures

MAY 14, 1986

RECEIVED
MAY 19 1986
CLINICAL DIRECTOR
COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH COUNCIL

CARL BELL, M.D.
COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH COUNC.
1001 EAST 87TH STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60619

DEAR DR. BELL:

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR ATTENDING OUR CITY-WIDE NO CRIME DAY STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING ON MAY 8, 1986 AT THE CHICAGO HILTON & TOWERS. YOUR PRESENCE WAS MOST APPRECIATED. YOUR ACCEPTANCE OF THE ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITY TO CHAIR OR SERVE ON ONE OF THE COMMITTEES IS A DEMONSTRATION OF YOUR COMMITMENT AND DEDICATION TO MAKING AUGUST 16, 1966 TRULY A NO CRIME DAY.

ATTACHED IS A LIST OF THE ATTENDEES AT OUR LAST MEETING, AND THE COMMITTEES ON WHICH WE AGREED TO DILIGENTLY SERVE.

AGAIN, THANK YOU FOR YOUR INPUT, INTEREST, AND SUPPORT. WE ARE GRATEFUL AND LOOKING FORWARD TO SEEING YOU AT OUR NEXT MEETING! IT IS SCHEDULED FOR JUNE 5, 1986 AT THE CHICAGO HILTON & TOWERS AT 8:00 A.M., IN THE MARQUETTE ROOM. PLEASE, PLEASE, MARK YOUR CALENDARS!

REMEMBER, WITH YOU, WE CAN DO IT, AND ONLY WITH YOU, CAN WE DO IT!

SINCERELY,

R. EUGENE PINCHAM
NO CRIME DAY CHAIRPERSON

FRANCES WILLIAMS
BLACK ON BLACK LOVE COORDINATOR

REP/FW/LH

1000 E. 87th St. Chicago, Il. 60619 (312) 978-0868

"NO CRIME DAY"

A CITY UNITED AGAINST CRIME

April 9, 1986

Crime and violence are city-wide concerns. The total community must mobilize in order to eradicate the fear and terror that starks our neighborhoods. An examination of the Index Crimes by types contained in the statistical Summary of the Chicago Police Department reveals the extent of it. These statistics include murder, rape, aggravated assault, robbery, burglary theft and auto theft. The promoting of and participation in "NO CRIME DAY" to encourage love, respect and self-discipline will have a positive city-wide effect.

OBJECTIVE(S) -

To foster a day where everyone is dedicated to the practice of law, respect and self-discipline. It will be a day of celebration of an emancipation from crime or criminal actions.

ACTIVITIES -

1. A "NO CRIME DAY" Planning Meeting in which city-wide communities are invited to formulate a plan for implementing a "NO CRIME DAY."

   a. April 10, 1986
      Chicago Hilton & Towers
      720 South Michigan Avenue
      Third Floor, Marquette Room
      8:00 a.m.

2. City-Wide Participation -

   - Neighborhood groups to plan activities.

   - Utilize existing designated events, activities if they fall on the specified day.

3. Culminate with a celebration activity at Daley Plaza on No Crime Day, August 16, 1986.

JOIN Mayor Harold Washington's "CHICAGO WAR AGAINST CRIME WEEK"

AUGUST 10 thru 16, 1986

Mayor Harold Washington has declared August 10–16, 1986 as "Chicago War Against Crime Week." All Chicago agencies, organizations, institutions, businesses and private citizens are urged to sponsor, support and participate in the many exciting activities and programs taking place during the week. Each day a specific group or theme will be highlighted, as indicated below, culminating with "No Crime Day," Saturday, August 16th. However, activities are in no way limited to those examples listed. To the contrary, additional activities should be developed consistent with the spirit of the week. Chicago's concerned citizens can exemplify the city's motto "Chicago Works Together" through a unified and resounding opposition to crime! Let's all get involved! After all, we do need each other. Together we will make a difference.

COORDINATED BY CHICAGO POLICE DEPARTMENT & CHICAGO INTERVENTION NETWORK

SUNDAY 10

"CHURCHES AGAINST CRIME"

- *Crime abatement through family unity messages
- *Open facilities for community activities
- *Special notices in church bulletins
- *Prayers for a crime-free City

MONDAY 11

"YOUTH AGAINST CRIME"

- *Central rally of Explorers, Daley Center Plaza
- *Local neighborhood youth rallies
- *"Say no to drugs" programs
- *Youth recreation and athletic programs

TUESDAY 12

"COMMUNITIES AGAINST CRIME"

- *"National Night Out"
- *Light up the City with evening outdoor activities—picnics, barbecues, etc.
- *Crime Prevention Seminars

WEDNESDAY 13

"SENIORS AGAINST CRIME"

- *Senior Citizen Crime Prevention/Awareness Programs activities
- *Senior outings and social activities

THURSDAY 14

"BUSINESS AGAINST CRIME"

- *Business Crime Prevention Programs and Seminars
- *Posturing against crime
- *Illuminate Premises overnight

FRIDAY 15

"FAMILIES AGAINST CRIME"

- *Family Workshops and Seminars
- *Planned family social activities

SATURDAY 16

"NO CRIME DAY"

- *Central Rally
- *Chicago Display of Unity
- *Decentralized activites throughout the City

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CALL: BUREAU of COMMUNITY SERVICES 744-5573 / 6253

HAROLD WASHINGTON
Mayor

CHICAGO WORKS TOGETHER

FRED RICE
Superintendent

I have proclaimed the week of August 10th through the 16th as "Chicago's War Against Crime Week." The entire week will focus on crime, its attendant social ills and ways the city can work to eradicate it. I know all the men, women and children of Chicago are concerned that Crime is a condition which threatens each and every one of us, not only individually, but in our neighborhoods and communities.

Chicago is a potpourri of churches, neighborhoods, communities, businesses, individuals, ethnic groups and races. And most of all, Chicago is concerned people, people that work together because they care. The week of August 10 - 16 is another example of Chicago, "united as one community," working for the common good, a crime-free society. I am asking each and every Chicagoan to demonstrate concern and support for not only the war against crime, but also for the day when Chicago will serve as the model for a crime-free city.

Harold Washington
Mayor, City of Chicago

I am pleased to join all citizens in support of Mayor Harold Washington's "Chicago War Against Crime Week." It is heart-warming to know that such divergent segments of the Chicago community have come together to express their strong desire for a crime-free environment. We in law enforcement sometimes think we stand alone in our commitment to suppress crime and criminality, and it strengthens our resolve to know that others are similarly committed.

To all of you who participate in this week's programs, I offer my sincerest thanks. Let's pray that some day soon we will see the "No Crime" wish become a reality.

Fred Rice, Superintendent
Chicago Police Department

"WE NEED EACH OTHER"

STRIKE OUT VIOLENCE FOR A SAFER COMMUNITY

APRIL 8 through APRIL 15, 1989

In observance of National Victim's Rights Week

Sponsored by:

Auxiliary, The Cleveland Bar Association
The Task Force on Violent Crime
The National Conference of Christians & Jews, Inc.
The Cuyahoga County Witness/Victim Service Center

With support from:

The Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Services

Blaushild Chevrolet/Blaushild Auto Leasing • Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co. • Schonfeld Financial Services

STRIKE OUT VIOLENCE FOR A SAFER COMMUNITY is a cooperative community effort dedicated to the concept that violence affects each one of us, whether as a perpetrator, victim or bystander. Each of us has a responsibility to contribute to the resolution of this pervasive problem. We hope that you will accept the challenge of the sponsoring community organizations and participate in the activities of the week and beyond.

For further information, please call The National Conference of Christians & Jews 752-3000

SATURDAY, APRIL 8, 1989
Sixth Annual Police Community Relations Conference

1989 -- A Changing Time: We Can Make A Difference
8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.
Holiday Inn Lakeside

Committee members and auxiliary personnel will be recognized. Workshops on youth problems and gangs, domestic violence, Crimewatch, and race relations.

Luncheon Speaker: Alan P. Dean, Executive Director
Montgomery County
Human Relations Commission
Rockville, MD

For lunch reservations (@ $10.00) or for further information call, Theasha Daniely at 664-2277.

Target Audience: District Committee volunteers, concerned citizens.

TUESDAY, APRIL 11, 1989
Religious Issues Regarding Family Violence
10:00 a.m. - 12:00 Noon
Cleveland State University
Room 364

How common religious teachings about the sanctity of the family, the authority of the parents and the notion of forgiveness sometimes cause conflict for survivors of family violence.

Presenter: Reverend James Leehan, Director
University Christian Movement

For further information, call 696-4116.

Target Audience: Clergy, religious educators, lay volunteers.

MONDAY, APRIL 10, 1989
Community Dinner Meeting

Black on Black Crime
5:00 - 7:00 p.m.
Liberty Hill Baptist Church
8206 Euclid Ave. (East 82nd & Euclid)
Enter on 82nd Street

To gather people together to address preliminarily the issues of crime and violence in general, drugs and black on black crime in particular; to set the tone for future meetings; to develop an agenda for action.

Presenters: Reverend Blanton Harper, Jr., Pastor
Liberty Hill Baptist Church
Co-Chair, Homicide Committee
The Task Force on Violent Crime
Dr. Carl Bell, Director
Community Mental Health Center, Chicago, IL
Deputy Chief A. Leonard Walton
Cleveland Police Department

Call 791-5841 between 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. $2.00 per person, reservations required.

Target Audience: Community Leaders

TUESDAY, APRIL 11, 1989
Prayer Vigil
12:00 - 1:00 p.m.
First United Methodist Church
3000 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44115
(Free parking in lot behind church)

A vigil to pay tribute to those victimized by violent crime. Reaffirm your commitment to stop crime and the senseless tragedies it causes. Recognize the six million Americans who become violent crime victims each year.

Keynote: Dr. Kenneth Chalker

Target Audience: Citizens concerned about violent crime, crime victims and their supporters.

TUESDAY, APRIL 11, 1989
Practice Seminar for Victims Compensation Claims: Changes in the Ohio Crime Compensation Program Effective March 14, 1989
12:00 Noon - 1:30 p.m.
Justice Center
Courtroom #21-B

Attorneys from the Ohio Attorney General's Victim Services Section and the Ohio Court of Claims Victims of Crime Program will be available to answer questions and provide advice and practice points about the investigation, appeal, and award processes.

Many victims of crime are turned away when they seek counsel for compensation claim despite the fact that the attorney fees are paid by the Court of Claims. The seminar is intended to help interested attorneys become more thorough and more efficient in their handling of compensation matters, and thus increase the level of available legal services.

Moderator: Honorable Burt W. Griffin, Judge
Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas

Presenters: John T. Williams, Chief, Victims of Crime Division
Attorney General's Office

Daniel Borchert, Deputy Clerk, Victims Division
Court of Claims of Ohio

James Hewitt, III, Commissioner
Court of Claims of Ohio, Victims of Crime Program

Target Audience: Attorneys who handle crime victims compensation claims in Ohio.

TUESDAY, APRIL 11, 1989
Building Conflict Resolution Skills in Your Students
3:00 - 4:30 p.m.
William Dean Howells School
4016 Woodbine

Conflict management skills for the classroom, cafeteria, playground and bus.

Presenter: Barbara Oehlberg, Family Life, Adult Education
Cleveland Public Schools

For further information call 696-2677

Target Audience: Teachers & school administrators.

TUESDAY, APRIL 11, 1989
Discipline without Guilt

How to discipline a child without damaging his/her self esteem
7:00 - 8:30 p.m.
Euclid Avenue Congregational Church
9606 Euclid Avenue

A child who feels good about him or herself is not likely to become either a victim or a perpetrator of violent crime.

Presenter: Rita Herzog, M.Ed.,
Center for Nonviolent Communication of
Northeast Ohio
(Program originated by Marshall Rosenberg)

For further information call Kathy Smith 791-5200.

Target Audience: Parents, teachers, and people who work with parents.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 1989
Child Abuse: The Teacher's Dilemma
9:00 a.m. - 12:00 Noon
Cleveland Marshall College of Law
Cleveland State University Moot Courtroom
1801 Euclid Avenue

This half-day workshop will address the various concerns and points where educators must intervene in cases of child abuse. It is designed to assist school personnel in recognizing and understanding the nature and extent of the problem. An overview of the Ohio Revised Code sections and administrative code rules pertaining to child abuse definitions, reporting, and confidentiality will be discussed. Participants will have the opportunity to review when, how, and to whom they should report suspected child abuse. **NOTE:** This workshop meets the training requirements of rules 5101: 2-12-32 OAC.

Coordinated by Marcia G. Zashin, Cleveland State University.

Moderator: Honorable Patricia Cleary, Judge
Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas

Presenters: Janice E. Rench, Author, Educator & Lecturer

Mary S. Hall, L.I.S.W.,
The Child Abuse Prevention Program Network

Marcia G. Zashin, Field Services Coordinator
Cleveland State University

Barbara Gallaway, M.S.S.A., Administrator
Department of Human Services, Attorney at Law

Gerald A. Strom, L.I.S.W., Social Work Supervisor
Pediatrics & Special Services
MetroHealth Medical Center

1:00 - 4:00 p.m.
Teens, Crime and the Community

A curriculum presentation including crime prevention, victims of crime, child abuse, acquaintance rape, drunk driving, property crime, juvenile justice and more.

Coordinated by Carolyn Javitch, Auxiliary, Cleveland Bar Association.

Moderator: Honorable Kenneth A. Rocco, Administrative Judge,
Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court

Presenters: Judith Zimmer, National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law

Elizabeth Dreyfuss, J.D. Assistant Dean for Community Education about Law

Laura Garrett, Teacher, South High School

R.S.V.P. by April 5, 1989 to Marcia G. Zashin at 687-4719.

Target Audience: Teachers, CSU Students, administrators, counselors, social workers, day care workers, school nurses

THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 1989
Battered Women's Syndrome
9:30 a.m. - 12:00 Noon
Justice Center
Courtroom #15-A

The purpose of this seminar is to discuss why expert testimony is necessary to ensure a fair trial for battered women. Dr. Rosewater will follow up with treatment issues.

Moderator: Daryl L. Novak, Manager
Cuyahoga County Witness Victim Service Center

Presenter: Lynn Rosewater, Ph.D., Clinical psychologist
Author of "Changing Through Therapy"

Target Audience: Clinicians, advocates, criminal justice professionals, health professionals.

THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 1989
Understanding the Violence in Pornography
Registration 9:30 a.m.
10:00 a.m. - 12:00 Noon
Mather Mansion
Cleveland State University
2605 Euclid Avenue

The issue: Does pornography cause violence or is pornography a symptom of violent power-seeking personality? This workshop will address behavior issues that lead to an interest in pornography.

Presenter: Beth Cagan, Ph.D., Associate Professor
Dept. of Social Work
First College, Cleveland State University

Co-Sponsored with ICGC, University Christian Movement, Dept. of Religious Studies and Social Work, CSU. Call the Inter-Church Council at 621-5925 for information.

Target Audience: Anyone interested in understanding pornography.

THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 1989
Domestic Violence and the Law
12:30 - 2:00 p.m.
Justice Center
Courtroom #15-A

Focus on Domestic Violence Law, a criminal and civil comparative analysis, procedures: psychological study of victims and perpetrators: new trends in the law, updates on legislation.

Moderator: Honorable Ronald B. Adrine, Judge,
Cleveland Municipal Court

Presenters: Diana Cyganovich, J.D. M.S.S.A.
Legal Advocate, Templum House Shelter

Alexandria Ruden, J.D.
Staff Attorney, Legal Aid Society

Target Audience: Attorneys, legal interns, law students and advocates.

FRIDAY, APRIL 14, 1989
Education of Homeless Children -- Ohio's Plan
9:00 - 10:00 a.m.
3:30 - 4:30 p.m.
Cleveland Board of Education Auditorium
1380 East Sixth Street

For more information call the Telephone Information Center of the Cleveland Public Schools at 574-TALK.

Presenters: Lisa Thomas, Director,
Health Care for the Homeless
Federation for Community Planning

Representatives from Women Together, Templum House and Zelma George Shelter

Mary Ostendorf, Supervisor of Human Resource Utilization, Cleveland Public Schools

Target Audience: General audience, school administrators, teachers, guidance counselors, school nurses and social workers.

FRIDAY APRIL 14, 1989
Reducing Violence through Social Skills Planning
10:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.
Cleveland Board of Education Auditorium
1380 East Sixth Street

Violence in American public and private life has reached the magnitude of an epidemic. Individuals are frequently exposed to influences which encourage them to be aggressive and possibly violent. Social Skills Training is an educational approach designed to help children and adults acquire social survival skills. Application of these skills will improve interpersonal relationships and allow individuals to function productively and successfully with others.

Presenters: Ruth W. Begun, Director
Society for Prevention of Violence

Peggy Mosely, Consultant
Society for Prevention of Violence

Target Audience: School administrators, school board members, service providers, concerned parents, corporate executives or personnel training representatives

FRIDAY, APRIL 14, 1989
Self Defense for Women
12 Noon - 1:00 p.m.
Justice Center
2nd Floor

Presenter: Carla Kole, Victim Advocate
Witness Victim Service Center

Target Audience: Any women interested in practical self-defence techniques. You don't have to be athletic to master these moves. Come to participate or observe.

ACTIVITIES SCHEDULED AFTER STRIKE OUT VIOLENCE WEEK

SATURDAY, APRIL 22, 1989
Community Advocacy Meeting Against Substance Abuse
10:00 a.m. - 12 Noon
Location (to be announced)

This two hour conference will focus on ways in which citizens can participate in dealing with drug problems in our community. Citizens Against Substance Abuse (C.A.S.A.), an organization similar to Mothers Against Drunk Driving (M.A.D.D.) will be highlighted at this meeting.
For further information call: 574-9165.
Sponsored by the Ohio City Redevelopment Association.

Target Audience: General community.

SUNDAY, APRIL 23, 1989
Strike Out Violence Day at the Stadium
in cooperation with the Cleveland Indians
Cleveland Indians vs. New York Yankees at 1:35 p.m.

Bring your kids to the ballpark, promote family spirit in support of ***Strike Out Violence for a Safer Community.***

Join us in showing community support for STRIKE OUT VIOLENCE FOR A SAFER COMMUNITY

STRIKE OUT VIOLENCE FOR A SAFER COMMUNITY
The National Conference of Christians & Jews
3645 Warrensville Center Road #205
Cleveland, Ohio 44122

NON-PROFIT ORG
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
CLEVELAND, OHIO
PERMIT 3017

CO-SPONSORS

All Hit 92Q
American Red Cross
Bellefaire/Jewish Children's Bureau
Bellflower Center for Prevention of Child Abuse
Catholic Social Services
Center for Nonviolent Communication of NE Ohio
Child Guidance Center of Greater Cleveland
City of Cleveland - Community Relations Board
City of Cleveland - Department of Public Safety
City of Cleveland - Probation Department
Cleveland Bar Association
Cleveland City Prosecutor's Office
Cleveland Indians
Cleveland Marshall College of Law
Cleveland NOW
Cleveland Police Department
Cleveland Public Library
Cleveland Public Schools
Cleveland Rape Crisis Center
Cleveland State University College of Education
Cleveland State University Department of Social Service/College of Arts & Science
Cleveland Treatment Center
Cleveland YWCA - DVOP
Court Community Service (CCS)
Court of Claims of Ohio
Court of Common Pleas Probation
Court of Common Pleas - Cuyahoga County
Cuyahoga County Department of Human Services
Cuyahoga County Department of Justice Affairs
Cuyahoga County Division of Youth Services
Cuyahoga County Jail Inmate Service
Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court
Cuyahoga County Public Library
Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority
Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority - Police Department
Displaced Homemakers' Program
East Ohio Gas Company
East Side Catholic Shelter
Family Life Education Office of Adult Education-Cleveland Public Schools
Federation for Community Planning
Friends of Shaker Square
Guardian Ad Litem Project (Domestic Relations Court)
Guardian Ad Litem Project (Juvenile Court)
Handgun Control Federation of Ohio
Interchurch Council of Greater Cleveland
Intra-Family Sexual Abuse Project (IFSAP)
Lake Erie Girl Scout Council
Lakewood Prevents Abuse
Lakewood Youth Service
Legal Aid Society of Cleveland
Liberty Hill Baptist Church
MetroHealth Center for Rehabilitation
MetroHealth Medical Center - Social Services Department
Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) Cuyahoga County
National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law
Neighborhood Centers Association
Ohio Attorney General's Office - Crime Victims Services Section
Ohio Bell - An Ameritech Company
Ohio City Redevelopment Association
Ohio Crime Prevention Association
Ohio Victim/Witness Association
ORCA House
Parents of Murdered Children, Cleveland & Lorain Chapters
Regional Council on Alcoholism of Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake & Lorain Counties
Shaker Heights Youth Center
Society for Prevention of Violence
St. Clair Superior Coalition
St. Vincent Charity Hospital Emergency Room
Templum House
Transitional East, Inc.
U.S. Attorney's Office
University Christian Movement
Volunteer Center - United Way Services
West Side Community Mental Health
West Side Women's Center
Western Reserve Area Agency on Aging
Women Together Inc.
WomenSpace

SAVE OUR SONS AND DAUGHTERS

NEWSLETTER

Box 32421, Detroit 48232 (313) 833-3030/345-2700 No. 14, July 8, 1988

"Do Our Youth Need Casino Gambling?"

SOSAD MEETING

SUN., JULY 17, 4-6 pm
at the SOSAD OFFICE

Coming Events

SUPPORT HARVEST '88 YOUTH

**CAR WASH & BAKE SALE. SAT., JULY 23, 11-4 pm. FENKELL & LAHSER.
**LARGE COLOR FAMILY PORTRAITS ONLY $5 each. Call 833-3030 for time and place.

VIOLENCE INTERVENTION/PREVENTION WORKSHOP

Weekend of August 5-7. Call 833-3030 to sign up so that you can teach our youth strategies for achieving WIN-WIN SOLUTIONS. See page 7.

TANNER '88. HBO, Mondays 10 pm

SOSAD will be featured in episode beginning July 11 and shown five times thereafter.

"20/20" SPECIAL ON SOSAD

Tentatively scheduled for Friday, August 5.

BEREAVEMENT SUPPORT GROUP

meets every Monday night from 7-9 pm at the SOSAD OFFICE. All family members and friends are welcome. We need each other.

A MESSAGE TO CHILDREN

BY CLEMENTINE BARFIELD

Make a difference for yourself and other youth this summer by being a part of SOSAD's Positive Change Campaign.

Teen slayings in Detroit dropped 26% the first half of 1988. SOSAD activities, police say, helped to bring about this drop. It is rewarding to know that SOSAD has made a small impact on this huge problem of youth killings. Through the violent death of our own children many of us made the commitment to struggle to preserve our future which is our youth. We see our own children living and growing through young people like yourself.

Now that school is out and you are looking for things to occupy your time, it is important that you do positive and creative things, because there is life beyond the street, beyond hanging out on the corner using and selling crack, beyond giving in to negative influences from peers, beyond wearing expensive clothes and gold ropes.

SOSAD has programs for young people. In HARVEST '88 teens are discovering the joys of working together to produce food from the Land. We conduct workshops in which you can learn strategies for resolving conflicts without violence. You can be a part of this program.

This summer can be the best or worst experience of your life. The choice is up to you. I challenge you to get involved in positive activities. --see back page.

CHURCH BUYS, RENOVATES DOPE HOUSES

12th St. Missionary Baptist Church (1840 Midland) provides a model of how the church can serve to rebuild the community.

Two years ago the church's Weekday Ministry decided to organize REACH (REACH EVERYONE ADMINISTER CARE AND HELP) to buy abandoned or about-to-be abandoned houses in the neighborhood and renovate them for Seniors and single parents in the congregation. So far REACH has renovated 5 houses and is working on 12 more. Money for the first 5 came from the church's own resources. Now REACH has received a Neighborhood Opportunity Grant of $120,000.

Most of the houses REACH has renovated were dope houses. Two years ago a woman was murdered on the front porch of one REACH house.

Renovating costs are not so great because members with skills (carpenters, electricians) work for less than they would ordinarily be paid. Other members do clean-up, etc.Those who hope to buy can accumulate sweat equity. The average cost of a house is $19,000. with a 5% down payment. House notes are approximately what people would pay for rent. One woman with clerical skills works in the office part-time to pay her note, while another man has been painting.

An important component of the program is Education. Counseling is given in Home Ownership so that REACH has had no problem with maintenance.

Pastor of 12th St. Missionary Baptist is Rev. Lee A. Earl who is very concerned with economic development. Charlene Johnson, REACH's Executive Director, is a former teacher who took a leave of absence to develop programs to strengthen the black family economically.

Tell our readers what YOUR church is doing about dope houses in YOUR neighborhood. Call Editor, 833-3030

WESTMINSTER'S COMMUNITY MINISTRY

With tears in our eyes, SOSAD and Westminster Church of Detroit (at Outer Drive and Hubbell) agreed we would help each other in the garden this summer.

After 5 years of maintaining our Helping Hands Garden at a member's home, Westminster felt it was time to put the garden on church property --to increase awareness in the community that we are concerned and committed to providing "A Helping Hand" to all people.Not just by producing food in the garden--to sustain the body--but by developing skills which put us in touch with Nature and God in it--to sustain our soul.

HARVEST '88 began in June with five intensive hours by 17 youngsters, 5 older youth and one determined 2-1/2 year old. This was the beginning of clearing, marking beds, levelling and planting approximately 20,000 sq.ft. of garden. We even survived June 25 (104°!). Through the week we have seen the garden 3/4th planted, and WE ARE EXCITED.

What a thrill to see bed after bed of plants and emerging seed! What a thrill to be there working with our Urban Farming Trainees as we hack away, discovering our buried treasures (rocks, concrete, sod clumps, whatever) enjoying their laughter, their problem-solving techniques, their quickness, their questions, their desire to do it well and go on!

We welcome SOSAD and our youth to Westminster as we explore and implement new ways to touch in a community of love. With tears in our eyes, in silence and quiet, may we all find the hope, the courage and the strength to go on.

JEAN WINTERBOTTOM
Community Ministry Chairperson

TEEN SPEAKOUT

ONE WEEK WITH HARVEST '88

HARVEST '88 had an exciting week. A representative from the 4H program gave us tips on our garden at the Westminster Church site. He also gave us tips on how we should run the program.

Then on Thursday morning we were on the KELLY & CO. SHOW, talking about whether youth between the ages of 12 and 17 should be charged as adults for the crime of murder. Personally I feel a person shouldn't go to prison. Because you can put people in prison and they come out doing worse than when they went in.

Afterwards Dr. McGovern from Frank's Nursery & Crafts spoke to us. He also gave us a variety of seeds and gardening gloves.

Next week the Urban Farming Trainees are going to Four Bears Water Park to spend some quality time relaxing.

Truly I can say the Lord is blessing us because we are rising up from the bottom.

DENYENE RIVERA

A LITTLE-BIG WAR

I am a 13 year old female concerned for the people of America. The world is in bad shape. It's like a little-big war going on in our very own country. We have certain difficult problems where I live, but they're not as bad as in places like Chicago, L.A., New York City, Miami, Boston and Detroit. Those are not healthy environments if you're looking to keep your life.

I was watching Ms. Barfield on THE DONAHUE SHOW. She made some good points. The problem of students hurting and killing each other is scary. Most of the time, when kids get in a conflict, they turn to weapons for protection but protection from WORDS! Sometimes it's even the teacher's fault. They suppose they can just push us students around when they want and then expel us from school. After teachers hit students,they're the ones protected and listened to. They're supposed to have open minds, not open hands.

Another issue is drugs. Also gangs take over cities, then move into small towns. They bring in guns and other weapons. I don't want to live in fear the rest of my life, so I'm going to try and do something about these problems. It's not just poor kids looking for a life of luxury or trying to support their family. It's also spoiled rich kids looking for attention, living life in the fast lane.

This is not the kind of world I want my little sisters and possible children to face. This world has a lot of bad and is going to face a rude awakening. Not many people will be prepared. Please help America and the rest of the world, then bless us!

LA MONICA SHELTON
Harrison, Tenn.

BE A GOOD LISTENER!

If I could pick THE TEACHER OF THE YEAR,I would pick Ms. Cathy Krudwig. She is concerned about you and me. She is a role model to every woman adult. She is a representative of love and friendship. Students want her for a teacher because she cares for and treats them with respect. She listens to her students' school and personal problems. Many students who go to her with an acute problem come out with a friend.

Cathy gave me some tips on how to help a person in need of help. The first step is being a good listener. This is a key factor in finding an option to a problem. The second step is letting them find the option to their problem. Do not tell them the solution. By talking it out they will find it themselves. The third step is offering suggestions. She says that most people who are depressed can't see that things won't always be so bad. Nothing is so bad. Things will get better.

COLLEEN M. SEAMAN

4.

By Ronald Hogan



THESE SUCKERS CARRY HOECARDS BECAUSE THEY'RE WEAK! THEY AIN'T STRONG, LIKE THE REAL ONES, WHO FIGHT HAND TO HAND, CHEEK TO CHEEK!

5.

HE WORKED AND STRUGGLED AND STUDIED AND LEARNED, AND EVERYTHING HE GOT THE PERPETRAITORS KNOW HE EARNED!
SNOOP
ONLY A FEW CAN REALLY CLAIM THE CLAIM TO TRULY BE STRONG! BECAUSE ONLY A FEW HAVE THE STRENGTH TO LIVE RIGHT AND AVOID ALL WRONG!
SO DON'T HANG WITH A LIAR, DON'T RUN WITH A THIEF, AND DON'T TAKE OR SELL DRUGS WHICH CAUSE DEATH, PAIN AND GRIEF!
CHARLIE DOWN IN CONCERT
GET YOURSELF TOGETHER, YOUR MIND, BODY AND SOUL. AND DON'T EVER LET ME CATCH YOU PLAYING THE PHONY PERPETRAITORS ROLE.
CHARLIE DOWN CAME INTO YOUR LIFE TODAY, TO GIVE YOU INSPIRATION FOR A BETTER WAY, TAKE HEED TO MY MESSAGE, CONSIDER WHAT YOU HEAR AND ASK GOD FOR THE STRENGTH TO PERSEVERE!
SCRATCH
SCRATCH

HEALTHVIEW

PEACE BE UNTO YOU.

Recently my husband and I were asked what we thought it would take for people to become more healthy. We simply answered "Correction, a new attitude, and the courage to accept change when it is for the improvement of one's health and well-being. This is how we grow." We have to educate ourselves and our children in regard to proper nutrition for the body, the mind and the spirit. All three must be nourished if we are to be healthier. We know it takes time and plenty of discipline to break old unhealthy habits. But if we want to have better health and healthier children it is a must. "Remember with every difficulty comes ease."

America is still one of the richest countries in the world. Yet the masses of its citizenry are the poorest in understanding the human body and its function. We shouldn't allow our children to grow up as many of us have, not knowing about themselves, not knowing about nutrition and the important role it plays in maintaining good sound health. Too many of us are malnourished physically, mentally and spiritually simply because we lack the proper understanding. If the contents within the body are not nourished, the body will become malnourished. The National Research Council's Food and Nutritive Board cites growing evidence of a link between diet and degenerative diseases, such as heart disease and cancer. Good health has to be learned and practiced. This is the best way to earn good health.

We find that the proper foods and the proper preparation of foods, exercise, a clean colon, good clean water, good clean fresh air, rest and peace with Almighty God and one's fellow man are a good place to start. This will provide a good foundation for getting into better health. Until mothers and cooks begin to become seriously interested in health and nutrition we will remain an unhealthy society.

6.

Good health, nutritionally speaking, begins in the soil and in the kitchen. Taking certain well-loved foods away from the person who is sick and ailing, or those without symptom of sickness is not easy. There is some opposition and some disagreement, until they are forced by ill-health to do so themselves. Many of us were raised on fatback, white flour, white sugar and fried foods, etc. These foods have been proven to cause bad health. "Whoever controls the kitchen controls the health of the family."

We take it for granted that snack foods, such as potato chips, soda pop, candy, cookies, cakes, pies, etc. will supply our bodies with the necessary fuel they need to function properly. The body cannot function properly on such unnourishing foodless foods. In time your body will demand the proper treatment or you will suffer an unexpected penalty for breaking one of the natural laws. It is only by the grace and mercy of our Creator that we function as well as we do eating unnourishing foods. In order for our bodies to resist dis-eases, we must change our unhealthy lifestyles Those of us who don't know how to prepare our foods will have to take the time to learn how to prepare food in such a way that as little as possible is lost of the essential vitamins and minerals.

The breaking down of the body is the result of wrong living. The bottom line is this: when we take on the right attitude and turn the unhealthy negative things around in our lives, we will get well. Seek healthy knowledge and by all means apply it to your life and share it with others.

MARY-YAM T. MUHAMMAD

AFL-CIO JOB CORPS

Provides youth 16-22 with GED or advanced training in Computers, Mechanics, Construction, etc. 9 Centers in 5 states. CASH SPENDING ALLOWANCE plus SAVINGS ACCOUNT FOR READJUSTMENT AFTER TRAINING. JOB PLACEMENT AFTER TRAINING. For more information call Ms.Perry, 894-6750.

THE GREATEST GIFT OF ALL

SOSAD now has in place a VIOLENCE INTERVENTION/PREVENTION TEAM to address the problem of Stress and Peaceful Conflict Resolution.

The team's role is to design and develop a program to train youth and group facilitators in a variety of methods of non-violent conflict resolution. To this end, five of us (Verna Slaughter, Carol Linn, Bernard Carter, Lee Rod Toneye and myself) were selected to represent SOSAD at a workshop sponsored by the Alternatives to Violence Project (AVP), June 18-19.

During the Grand Prix weekend we spent two 12-hour days. It was difficult to give up an entire weekend for a workshop, but once it was on its way, everyone realized we were involved in something momentous.

We are eager to share our gift with SOSAD members, affiliates and other community organizations. The gift is one of Love, Trust, Community, Transforming Power, Clear Communication, Self-Esteem and a host of other values. The word "gift" is appropriate in this case because it is a gift to affirm the views of another person and to have one's views affirmed in return. Just as the gift was given to us in an environment of "No Putdowns," that is the way we will share it with others. Moreover, it is important that a person does not volunteer another person. The right to pass is a must.

During our sessions with AVP we learned that the gift comes from within as well as from without. We found that as we sincerely listened to others and in turn were sincerely listened to, we were transformed. We spoke from our hearts about what we liked about ourselves, what makes us feel good and trusting towards others, what we like about our group, the changes we would like to make and the things we learned about ourselves during the workshop.

It was a real struggle to understand the relation between Clear Communication, Conflict Resolution and Transforming Power. Yet the movement through the struggle was the presentation of the Gift of Love, Community, Trust and Transforming Power.

June 25 we gave a workshop to 22 youth at Calvary United Methodist Church, practicing problem-solving strategies to achieve Win-Win solutions. The young people presented SOSAD with a certificate of appreciation and a donation. We look forward to helping others give themselves the greatest gift of all: LOVE. Please come to SOSAD meetings and workshops sponsored by SOSAD'S VIOLENCE INTERVENTION/PREVENTION TEAM.

ROBERT G. COOPER

Make the world safe for children

This fall the CENTER FOR PEACE AND CONFLICT STUDIES will hold workshops on Dispute Resolution, Art & Visions of Peace and a World of Peace and Justice, and planning for the 30th Anniversary of the UN Declaration of the Rights of the Child. A special symposium on "Understanding and Responding to Violence in Young Children" will be held in the Spring of 1989. Call Marilyn Schmidt at 577-3453/577-3468 if you would like to participate.

WANTED

- VOLUNTEERS TO STAFF SOSAD OFFICE.
- USED SCHOOLBOOKS FOR HARVEST '88 TUTORIALS.

FOR SUMMER ACTIVITIES, CALL:

Youth Commission, 224-1331.
Child Care Coordinating Council, 579-2777.
Parks & Recreation:
Camp Council, 833-0622
Swimming, Arts & Crafts, Sports, Games, Field Trips, 224-1100.
Metropolitan Camp Council, 833-0622.
United Community Services Summer Programs, 833-0622.

SUMMER WORKSHOPS, SPECIAL EVENTS
Detroit Public Library Summer Reading Program, 833-1490 or branches.
Detroit Historical Museum, 833-1805.
Science Center, 577-8400.
Heritage House, 871-1667.

8.

A MESSAGE TO CHILDREN from page one.

Detroit has 34 Recreation Centers throughout the city with 19 swimming pools and many youth activities; they are all free of charge. So check out your Y, your local library and community associations for summer programs. Be selective of where you go and what you do for fun and entertainment. Be very selective in choosing your friends. Many of the children who lost their lives were killed because of who they were with. Learning can also be fun, so include things that will stimulate your mind and imagination.

This summer can be a safe and happy time for you. We have already lost too many children as victims or perpetrators. Now is the time for change. WE LOVE YOU!!!

SOSAD OFFICE
453 MLK BLVD.
Detroit 48201
(313) 833-3030

SOSAD TALK SHOW WDTR FM 90.9

WEDNESDAYS, 3-4 pm

Cohosts: Clementine Barfield & Ron Scott

Call 494-0964/5/6

JOIN SOSAD

and become part of the Movement to Save Our Sons and Daughters!!!

SOSAD, Box 32421, Detroit 48232
I would like to become a member.
Name _____
Address _____ Zip ___
Phone ___ ___ ___ ___
Individual membership $10; Youth, Senior, Unemployed $1; Family $15; Corporate, Church, Union or other organization $100.

ONE HUNDRED FIRST CONGRESS
GEORGE MILLER, CALIFORNIA
CHAIRMAN
WILLIAM LEHMAN, FLORIDA
PATRICIA SCHROEDER, COLORADO
LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS, LOUISIANA
MATTHEW F. MCHUGH, NEW YORK
TED WEISS, NEW YORK
BERYL ANTHONY, JR., ARKANSAS
BARBARA BOXER, CALIFORNIA
SANDER M. LEVIN, MICHIGAN
BRUCE A. MORRISON, CONNECTICUT
J. ROY ROWLAND, GEORGIA
GERRY SIKORSKI, MINNESOTA
ALAN WHEAT, MISSOURI
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, CALIFORNIA
LANE EVANS, ILLINOIS
RICHARD J. DURBIN, ILLINOIS
DAVID E. SKAGGS, COLORADO
BILL SARPALIUS, TEXAS

ANN ROSEWATER
STAFF DIRECTOR

TELEPHONE 226-7660

U.S. House of Representatives

SELECT COMMITTEE ON
CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES
385 HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING ANNEX 2
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
May 19, 1989

THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR., VIRGINIA
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER
FRANK R. WOLF, VIRGINIA
BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH, NEVADA
ROB PACKARD, CALIFORNIA
J. DENNIS HASTERT, ILLINOIS
CLYDE C. HOLLOWAY, LOUISIANA
FRED GRANDY, IOWA
CURT WELDON, PENNSYLVANIA
LAMAR S. SMITH, TEXAS
PETER SMITH, VERMONT
JAMES T. WALSH, NEW YORK
RONALD K. MACHTLEY, RHODE ISLAND

DENNIS G. SMITH
MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

CAROL M. STATUTO
MINORITY DEPUTY STAFF DIRECTOR

TELEPHONE 226-7660

The Honorable Reggie B. Walton
District of Columbia Superior Court
500 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001

Dear Judge Walton:

Thank you for your participation in our hearing, "Down These Mean Streets: Violence By and Against America's Children," held earlier this week. I especially appreciated your expression of the need for a balanced strategy incorporating both law enforcement and preventive programs to address violence affecting America's youth.

In an effort to conserve time, Representative Lamar Smith asked that witnesses be permitted to respond in writing to questions. The following are the questions he has directed to you:

1. Should parents of juveniles be held accountable for their children's actions?

2. You are known for your stern lectures to young men before the bench, on their responsibilities to themselves, their families, and the community. What points do you try to make to them?

3. You state that "young people involved in the illegal drug trade do so because the risk of prosecution does not act as a deterrent." What kinds of new approaches to this problem might be made which will deter these children?

We would appreciate your forwarding the answers to these questions to the committee as soon as possible so that they may be included in the printed record of the hearing.

Once again, thanks for your appearance before the committee, and I look forward to additional opportunities to work together.

Sincerely,

George Miller

GEORGE MILLER
Chairman

CC: Hon. Thomas J. Bliley, Jr.
Hon. Lamar S. Smith

Response to Questions Posed by Congressman Lamar Smith

1. Should parents of juveniles be held accountable for their children's actions?

Answer: This is a difficult question and I believe the answer depends on the circumstances. There has clearly been a breakdown in parental responsibility and steps must be taken to fill this void. However, strict liability against parents for all criminal acts committed by their children seems unduly harsh. For example, if the only parent in the home is the mother and the delinquent child is a teenage son who is bigger and stronger than the mother, absent direct participation in the son's conduct by the mother, parental liability would be unfair and legally unacceptable. However, if the parent directly participates in the child's conduct or in some way encourages the commission of an act committed by a child, liability (civil or criminal) would seem appropriate. For example, if the mother of the young man who recently shot and killed his twelve-year-old girlfriend gave her son the gun used to shoot the decedent as alleged by the media, then the mother should be held accountable for her son's conduct.

2. You are known for your stern lectures to young men before the bench, on their responsibility to themselves, their families, and community. What points do you try to make to them?

Answer: It depends on the circumstances. In most situations, I am merely trying to make them understand why I am imposing the sentence I have decided to impose. I think it is very important that they understand the rationale behind the sentences they were given. In addition, I may deem it appropriate to let them know that by engaging in negative behavior, they are destroying opportunities afforded to them by others who made significant sacrifices on their behalf. I may also deem it appropriate to insist that they accept responsibility for their conduct because of the detrimental effect their conduct is having on their families and community.

One group of young men I am particularly hard on are those who have children they are not caring for. Since I believe that absent fathers play a significant role in the negative behavior engaged in by their children, I try to make them to appreciate that they have an obligation to care for their children. I challenge them to act maturely with the hope that the challenge will be accepted.

In the final analysis, my lectures constitute an attempt to force young people to accept responsibility for their conduct and/or to force them to change their conduct.

3. You state that "young people involved in the illegal drug trade do so because the risk of prosecution does not act as a deterrent." What kinds of new approaches to this problem might be made which will deter these children?

Answer: I believe that all people, including children, expect to be punished if they are caught violating the law. In our present system that is not reality. While punishment can take the form of incapacitation, that need not always be the case.

For the first offender, demands must be placed on the child with the hope that positive changes will be encouraged. For example, since many juveniles who commit crimes do not regularly attend school, a requirement that school be attended and that their behavior when present be appropriate, might constitute adequate punishment. Likewise, community service or the attendance of after school tutorial programs might also be adequate punishment.

In any event, I firmly believe that all negative behavior when detected must be punished. If the message gets out that non-compliance with the law or with conditions set by the court as conditions of community release will result in adverse consequences, I believe the incidents of negative behavior will decrease.

ONE HUNDRED FIRST CONGRESS
GEORGE MILLER, CALIFORNIA
CHAIRMAN
WILLIAM LEHMAN, FLORIDA
PATRICIA SCHROEDER, COLORADO
LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS, LOUISIANA
MATTHEW F. MCHUGH, NEW YORK
TED WEISS, NEW YORK
BERYL ANTHONY, JR., ARKANSAS
BARBARA BOXER, CALIFORNIA
SANDER M. LEVIN, MICHIGAN
BRUCE A. MORRISON, CONNECTICUT
J. ROY ROWLAND, GEORGIA
GERRY SIKORSKI, MINNESOTA
ALAN WHEAT, MISSOURI
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, CALIFORNIA
LANE EVANS, ILLINOIS
RICHARD J. DURBIN, ILLINOIS
DAVID E. SKAGGS, COLORADO
BILL SARPALIUS, TEXAS

ANN ROSEWATER
STAFF DIRECTOR

TELEPHONE: 226-7660

U.S. House of Representatives

SELECT COMMITTEE ON
CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES
385 House Office Building Annex 2
Washington, DC 20515
May 19, 1989

THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR., VIRGINIA
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

FRANK R. WOLF, VIRGINIA
BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH, NEVADA
RON PACKARD, CALIFORNIA
J. DENNIS HASTERT, ILLINOIS
ELTON C. HOLLOWAY, LOUISIANA
FRED GRANDY, IOWA
CURT WELDON, PENNSYLVANIA
LAMAR S. SMITH, TEXAS
PETER SMITH, VERMONT
JAMES T. WALSH, NEW YORK
RONALD K. MACHTLEY, RHODE ISLAND

DEBBIE G. SMITH
MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

CAROL M. STARUTO
MINORITY DEPUTY STAFF DIRECTOR

TELEPHONE: 226-7660

Ms. Deborah Meier, Principal
Central Park East Secondary School
1573 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10029

Dear Ms. Meier:

Thank you for your participation in our hearing, "Down These Mean Streets: Violence By and Against America's Children," held earlier this week. I was especially moved by your thoughtful portrait of the circumstances your students -- and millions of young adolescents -- face in their families, their neighborhoods, and their schools.

In an effort to conserve time, Representative Lamar Smith asked that witnesses be permitted to respond in writing to questions. The following are the questions he has directed to you:

1. In your testimony you referred to parental choice in schools. What do you think of giving vouchers to parents?

2. Would you give some examples of how you see schools "undermining parental authority?"

We would appreciate your forwarding the answer to these questions to the committee as soon as possible so that they may be included in the printed record of the hearing.

Once again, thanks for your appearance before the committee, and I look forward to additional opportunities to work together.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MILLER
Chairman
Select Committee on Children,
Youth, and Families

CC: Hon. Thomas J. Bliley, Jr.
Hon. Lamar S. Smith

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS POSED BY CONGRESSMAN LAMAR SMITH (R-TEX.)

1. What do you think of giving vouchers to parents?

I am committed to public schools of choice and therefore would not support the notion of vouchers for private school education. I think that neither parents nor teachers should be required to work and learn at schools they do not support. But I do think public schools can be designed so that they accommodate a variety of accepted educational approaches. In my view vouchers will undermine public school education.

2. Would you give some examples of how schools undermine parental authority.

Parental authority is undermined by many institutions in our society. Schools are only one place where they are met with disrespect. Poor parents, in particular, are frequently given the impression that school authorities, not they, know best how to discipline and educate their children.

When school authorities place themselves above parents rather than seeking a partnership with parents, they undermine parental authority. And finally, poverty, joblessness, unmet housing and health needs undermine both the authority and status of parents. It makes parents seem unsuccessful to their children, less worthy of respect.

Deborah Meier
Central Park East Secondary School
New York City
September 19, 1989